



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

# The American Catholic quarterly review

205  
H5123



LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

ANNEX



**ANNEX**











THE  
AMERICAN  
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat  
invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantum sive confitentum.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii, AD PASCENT.

---

VOLUME IV.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1879.

---

ALLAN BREWER, 1883

LIBRARY

PHILADELPHIA:  
HARDY & MAHONY,  
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,  
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

134288

---

COPYRIGHT, 1879,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

---

YRABU!  
WORLD, CROBIAZ CIA, RI  
YRABU

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<b>THEORIES OF EDUCATION AND LIFE.—THOMAS CARLYLE.</b> By <i>Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	1
<p>The aim and end of education, 1; Different persons differently affected by wrongdoing, 2; Examples drawn from education among different nations, 3; The Knight and the Monk in the Middle Ages, 5; Education the effort to create the ideal man, 6; The two ways of viewing human life, 7; Philosophy on the unchristian basis, 8; Carlyle's Pantheism, 10; Scientific Atheism, 12; Carlyle on Man's spiritual nature, 14; The results of Atheism as expressed by Mr. Carlyle, 15; His contempt for those who are called religious, 16; The service he might have rendered the Church, 17; The doctrine of hero worship, 17; What does he mean by the love of God? 19; Mr. Carlyle not an original thinker, 20; "Unhappy men who do not love," 21.</p>	
<b>CEDMON: HIS GENIUS AND INFLUENCE.</b> By <i>Brother Azarias</i> , . . . . .	22
<p>Morley's "Early English Writers," 22; Bishop Aidann and the Abbess Hilda, 24; Cedmon's life buried in obscurity, 25; First effusions of the great poet, 26; The first to wed the Anglo-Saxon tongue to immortal verse, 29; He reaches the pinnacle of fame, 30; Sublime and pure loftiness of his thoughts, 31; The secret of his success, 32; The holiness of his life added weight to his words, 33; Cedmon's spirit as embodied in his poetry, 35; Examples from his great work, 35 <i>et seq.</i>; Not to be judged by modern standards of criticism, 41; The poetry of Cedmon a revelation to the people, 43; Popularity of Cedmon's poems, 44; Their effect upon the whole Teutonic race, 45; Later developments of his writings, 46.</p>	
<b>THE HUMAN SOUL AND BODY.</b> By <i>Rev. Walter Hill, S. J.</i> , . . . . .	48
<p>The human soul and human knowledge, 48; How we obtain a knowledge of the mind, 50; Evil results of the desire for novelty, 50; What theory best serves to explain man's nature, 52; The properties of matter and their scope, 54; How far science and philosophy go in these matters, 55; Impossibility of extension in matter, 56; How to account for the different species of matter, 58; Some new theories and their difficulties, 58; The theory of extension and of sensible qualities in matter, 61; The philosophy of Euler, Locke, and Descartes, 62; The theory of pre-established harmony, 63; Illustration of and a common objection to these theories, 64; The theory most consistent with reason, 65.</p>	
<b>THE PRESENT INDUSTRIAL CONDITION OF IRELAND.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas Quigley</i> , . . . . .	67
<p>Sullivan and Spenser on Ireland, 67; Ireland under the Penal Laws, 68; Situation, climate, soil and population of the country, 69; Statistics taken from Thom's Directory, 70; Banking in Ireland, 71; Live stock and crops, 72; Commerce and manufactures, 73; Causes of Ireland's backwardness, 74; The land questions, 75; The principle of Feudalism, 76; How it has worked in Ireland, 77; Comparative Census, 78; Who own the land, 79; What Ireland might be under favorable conditions, 80.</p>	
<b>AN AUTUMN IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.</b> By <i>Gen. John Gibbon, U. S. A.</i> , . . . . .	81
<p>Lewis and Clark's expedition, 81; Following the trail, 82; Shishequaw and Fort Mountain, 83; Discovery of a new pass, 84; The Helena Hot Springs, 85; Climbing the Mountains, 86; What was seen there, 87; A hotel in the mountains, 88; Warm Spring Creek, 89; Appearance of this place, 91; A truly beautiful scene, 92; True Western hospitality, 93; A fowling journey, 94; Journeying in the snow, 96; Contrast of the scenery on either side of the Rocky Mountains, 98; The Bench Lands of the Western Slope, 99; Concluding remarks, 100.</p>	
<b>WAS SHAKESPEARE A CATHOLIC?</b> By <i>S. B. A. Harper</i> , . . . . .	101
<p>Peculiar interest inherent in this subject, 101; Condition of England when Shakespeare was born, 102; Queen Elizabeth's relations to Protestantism, 103; Dearth of contemporary evidence regarding Shakespeare's religion, 104; Strong presumptions, 105; Only twice in his writings does he attack Rome, 106; Weakness of these evidences, 108; "Henry VIII," 109; Quotations, 110; Character of Wolsey, 112; Shakespeare does not paint him with an un-Catholic hand, 113; The poet's picture of Queen Katharine, 114; The whole temper and spirit of Shakespeare eminently conservative, 114; Proofs from his other plays, 115; Why it is reasonable to believe that Shakespeare was a Catholic, 116; He was certainly not a Puritan, 117; His pictures of the regular clergy, 118; His familiarity with the customs and phraseology of the Church, 120; Conclusion, 121.</p>	



	PAGE
HOW HERESY DEALS WITH THE BIBLE. By <i>Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	123
Protestant boasting about the growth of Bible knowledge, 123; Biblical knowledge developing into subtle doubt, 124; How Catholics look upon the Bible, 125; What the heretics during the early age of the Church thought of the Bible, 126; Prompted by expediency rather than by honest belief, 129; Falsifying God's revealed Word, 130; False interpretations, 131; Heretics have no respect for the Scriptures, 132; Luther's Canon of Scriptures, 133; The work begun by Luther ardently carried out by his followers, 136; Untruthful translations of the Bible, 137.	
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE RECENT TRANS- LATION OF ALZOG. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.</i> , . . . . .	138
The American supplement to Alzog's work; O'Kane Murray as an authority; The Fable of Friar Juan Xuaréz, 138; The work equally misleading for the French as for the Spanish portion of our present country, 139; Position of Catholics in the English Colonies, 140; The See of New Orleans, 140; Who was Father Charles Carroll? 141; Minor errors, 142.	
CATHOLICITY AND PROTESTANTISM IN RELATION TO OUR FUTURE AS A PEOPLE. By <i>George D. Wolf</i> , . . . . .	143
The once bright prospects of a glorious future, 143; The late decided change of feeling, 144; The conservative power supposed to reside in the American people, 145; Intelligence alone no safeguard against corruption, 146; The place of religion in our polity, 147; Grounds for questioning the ability of Protestantism to supply the religious want, 148; The question of personal integrity and honesty, 150; Inability of Protestantism to reconcile existing antagonisms, 151; Protestantism not to be relied upon as a corrective of disregard for law, 152; The influence of Catholicity, 154; By what strong bonds Catholic society is held together, 155; How the doctrines of the Church promote the practice of virtue, 156; The Church and the poor, 160; Protestantism checked the law of Universal charity, 162; Reverence for the majesty and divine authority of law—Conclusion, 163.	
CORRESPONDENCE—MISSIONARY RECTORS. By <i>Rev. F. Porphyrius</i> , . . . .	164
THE OUTLOOK, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL, IN EUROPE. By <i>A. de G.</i> , . . . .	163
Europe in 1878, 193; A great crisis, 194; Intellectual hunger of the age, 195; The theory of evolution, 197; The wonderful facilities for propagating knowledge in our time, 198; A creed that intoxicates, 199; Poverty not a cause of evil, 200; Socialism and the governments of Europe, 201; Church and State, 202; Condition of mankind in pre-Christian times, 203; Society and the Reformation, 204; Civil marriage, 205; Education in our day, 206; The condition to which the Falk laws have reduced Germany, 207; Condition of affairs in France, Italy, Austria, and other countries, 208; The State to blame for the evils which threaten it, 209; Religion the only remedy for the existing state of affairs, 210; On what depends the future, 211.	
CATHOLIC SOCIETIES. By <i>Rt. Rev. Francis S. Chatard, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	212
What is meant by Catholic Societies, 212; How our societies should be constituted, 213; Origin of Confraternities, 214; The mutual aid societies of the present day, 215; Our societies should be organized on the basis of religion, 216; The dangers that threaten our societies, 217; First duty of a Catholic society, 218; Catholic societies and the labor question, 219; Closing remarks, 221.	
THE RELATION OF THE POPES TO LITERATURE PRIOR TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY. By <i>Rev. H. A. Brann, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	222
The Popes have always been the patrons of theology, 222; But literature is the object of this article, 223; The Church and the drama, 224; Literature among the early Christians, 225; The Popes encouraged learning then as now, 227; Difficulties during the era of persecution, 228; First establishment of parochial and other schools, 230; Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, 231; Literary culture of the Romans in the sixth and seventh centuries, 232; Gregory the Great, 233; The lights of the eighth and ninth centuries, 235; The partial eclipse of the tenth, 236; Two great names—Gerbert and Hildebrand, 237; Great works of the Papacy, 238; Hallam on the Popes of this period, 239.	
THE RAPID INCREASE OF THE DANGEROUS CLASSES IN THE UNITED STATES. By <i>John Gilmary Shea, LL. D.</i> , . . . . .	240
Lowering of moral tone and growth of pauperism, 240; Impossibility of effecting moral reformation by merely natural means, 241; Effects of a general religious decline in America, 242; Abuse of education, 243; Other causes of decline and crime, 244; Abuses in religion, 245; Contrast between the Church and the Sects, 247; Protestantism has lost its hold on the masses, 248; How this result tends to foster crime, 249; Moral condition of the foreign element, 250; What has been and is its bane, 251; German and Italian emigrants, 251; The Chinese question in California, 253; The prevailing evils of New York City, 254; Difficulty of reforming homeless children, 255; The war a cause of increase in crime, 256; Proselytism one of the greatest curses of the American social system, 258; The Catholic Church and the poor, 260; The line of action for Catholics to follow, 261; What the Church has done and is doing for the people, 262; Catholic institutions meet the wants of the times, 265; The colonization movement, 266; A great Catholic university needed, 267.	

# Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
<b>ADMISSIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES.</b> By <i>Rt. Rev. Thomas A. Becker, D.D.,</i>	268
Scope and character of this essay, 268; Those who know the truth and those who do not, 270; The doctrines of infallibility and transubstantiation, 271; Admissions in points of doctrine, 272; The lack of unity and infallible authority among the sects, 274; Protestants and the mystery of Redemption, 276; Prayers for the dead, 277; An unwilling compliment to the Church, 278; Matters of practice among Catholics, 279; Daily service in the Catholic churches, 280; Permanence and dignity of charitable institutions in the Church, 283; The work accomplished by Religious Orders, 285; Value of the attendance of a priest at the death-bed, 285; Catholic patriotism and loyalty, 287.	
<b>THE FALL AND RISE OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas Quigley,</i>	288
The Church not to be blamed for the backwardness of education anywhere, 288; Condition of Ireland when the Roman empire was broken up, 290; The Danish and Norman invasions of Ireland, 291; Why no great University was established in Ireland, 292; What the Reformation did with the old Irish colleges, 293; Ireland in the seventeenth century, 294; Adoption of extraordinary means to destroy "Popery" in Ireland, 295; Irish colleges on the continent, 297; The Charter Schools of 1793, 298; Bishop Doyle, 299; Lord Stanley's Primary Education Bill, 300; Statistics and workings of the National Schools, 301; Catholic colleges for intermediate education, 302; The Queen's Colleges and the Catholic University, 303; Benefits of a Catholic University not properly appreciated, 304.	
<b>STEPS TO ATHEISM.</b> By <i>Rev. Joseph Shea, S. J.,</i>	305
Atheism a gradual growth, 305; Commission of and perseverance in sin a step towards Atheism, 306; Certain kinds of sin that more especially foster this horrible vice, 307; Intellectual pride, 308; The politicians furnish the next step to Atheism, 310; Impatience under trials, 311; Irreverence and contempt of holy things, 312; The Church and the money question, 313; Heresy a high road to Atheism, 314; Erroneous views in the field of philosophy, 314; Denial of the soul's immortality, 315; Believing what we please, 315; Summary of what has been said, 316.	
<b>THE PURSUIT OF "JOSEPH."</b> By <i>Gen. John Gibbon, U. S. A.,</i>	317
Outbreak of the Nez Percés war, 317; Concentration of United States troops, 318; Following the trail, 319; News of the Nez Percés, 321; An interesting march, 322; A messenger sent to a Flathead chief, 323; The march continued, 324; Important information, 325; The Indians and the United States authorities, 326; Continuing the journey, 327; An interesting point of the trail, 328; Crossing a formidable ridge, 329; Sure traces of the natives, 331; Coming up with the enemy, 333; The silent approach, 334; Commencing the fight, 336; Necessity of tact, 337; The battle becomes hot, 338; The Indians resort to a stratagem, 339; A messenger dispatched to Deer Lodge, 340; Arrival of General Howard, 341; Particulars of the battle of Big Hole, 342; Scenes after the battle, 343; Returning to Deer Lodge, 344.	
<b>VERNACULAR VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE, OLD AND NEW.</b> By <i>Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.,</i>	344
Those who lay violent hands upon God's Word, 344; Object of the Ebionites in translating the Scriptures, 345; Their Anglican Apologist, 346; Authorized translations in the early ages, 347; Why translations were not abundant in the Middle Ages, 348; Zealous biblical scholars of those times, 350; Number of vernacular versions then produced, 352; What has become of them, 353; The destruction of books the work of ruffians, 355; Mistranslation of the Bible never known in the Christian Church, 356; Luther, the founder of the Modern school of mistranslation, 357; His perversion of texts, 358 <i>et seq.</i> ; The Christian world indignant at his scriptural work, 364; Luther justifying his own conduct, 367; More specimens of the Reformer's style, 368; Character of the English Protestant translations, 369.	
<b>RELIGION AND CULTURE.</b> By <i>Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D.,</i>	389
Our good qualities are acquired, 389; Meaning of the word culture, 390; Abuses of education, 391; The sphere of culture, 392; Puritan character pervading our literature, 393; The preparations for a higher culture have been made by Americans, 394; The new paganism called culture, 396; All heroic conduct springs from the confidence which comes of faith, 397; Various views on the subject, 398; What men of culture can do for the world, 399; The subject considered apart from the aspect of religious faith and morality, 401; Culture akin to poetry, life mostly prose, 402; Relation of the Catholic Church to culture, 404; Mr. Arnold's cultism not original, 406; One may be a lover of culture and a Christian at the same time, 409; Self-constituted apostles of culture, 412; What Catholics can do and should do for culture, 413.	
<b>THE PRESENT POLITICAL CONDITION OF IRELAND.</b> By <i>Rev. Thomas Quigley,</i>	415
Last years of the Irish Parliament, 415; The Act of Union and the rise of O'Connell, 416; By whom O'Connell was supported, 417; Effects of Emancipation, 418; His repeal movement, 419; The Young Ireland party, 420; The principle of resistance to established power, 421; Who were the Young Ireland leaders, 422; Origin of the Fenian Society, 423; Its rise and decline, 424; Ireland and the Papacy, 425; Home Rule and its fundamental principles, 426; A general outline of the movement, 428; How Home Rule may be obtained, 429; The hope of Ireland rests in its rising generation, 430.	

	PAGE
<b>SOCIALISM CONSIDERED IN ITS ORIGIN AND FIRST MANIFESTATIONS.</b> By <i>Rev. Aug. J. Thébaut, S. J.,</i> . . . . .	431
Recent ominous expansion of socialism, 431; The social system intimately connected with politics, 433; The various stages through which human society has passed, 433; Change effected by Christianity, 434; Socialism totally unknown before the French Revolution, 436; What the world now means by liberty and freedom, 437; The principle of equality, 438; Those who adopted the principles of the Revolution, 439; What they meant by fraternity, 440; The Revolutionists' hatred of religion, 440; Babeuf's social code, 441; The hold they took on the world, 443; There is a social science which has not broken loose from Christianity, 444; The new outbreak fatally opportune, 445; Saint-Simonism, 447; Fourier's system, 448; It has passed away, 451; Socialism in the United States, 452; Condition of affairs in Europe in the Middle Ages, 453; Why the difference of condition between ancient and modern times, 454; A remedy proposed for modern evils, 455.	
<b>A REVIEW OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.</b> By <i>M. M.,</i> . . . . .	456
The writer's reason for choosing a ground often trodden before, 456; Effects of the dispersion of the human race and of climate upon the mind, 457; The ancient Britons and the Roman invasion, 458; Change effected by the Saxons, 459; Their conversion and first acquaintance with letters, 460; King Alfred and the foundation of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, 461; The Norman Conquest, 462; Who cultivated literature in the Middle Ages, 464; The transition state of England, 465; The period of foundation of the great universities, 466; Amalgamation of the Norman and Saxon races, 467; The Father of English literature, 468; Birth of Scottish poetry, 470; The war of the Roses and what followed, 471; Beginning of the modern history of England, 471; Sir Thomas More, 472; Critical cultivation of the language begun, 474; The Elizabethan era, 475; Shakespeare, 477; Writers of the seventeenth century, 478; Milton and his contemporaries, 480; Dryden, 481; Pope and others, 482; The writers of the eighteenth century, 483; The second golden age of English literature, 485; A retrospective review of what has been said, 487; Contemporary writers, 488.	
<b>ENGLISH DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY IN THE OLDEN TIME.</b> By <i>Rev. H. J. Coleridge, S. J.,</i> . . . . .	490
Example set to America by Old England, 490; What remains of the England of the Ages of Faith, 491; Mr. Waterton's devotion and researches, 492; The Religious Orders of the Middle Ages, 493; The manner in which this devotion manifested itself, 495; Shrines and devotions, 496; Pilgrimages, 498; Devotion to the Blessed Virgin at Oxford, 500; The old prayers and forms of devotion to our Blessed Lady, 501; Old hymns in her honor, 503; Concluding remarks, 505.	
<b>NEWSPAPERS AND NOVELS.</b> By <i>A. de G.,</i> . . . . .	506
A false conclusion often drawn, 506; Intellectual activity of the present day combined with lassitude of thought, 507; The theory that "knowledge is power" exemplified in the newspaper press, 508; Carelessness in selecting what to read, 509; Different kinds of newspapers, 510; Causes of the circulation of cheap and bad newspapers, 512; Has the press done more evil than good? 513; Novels and who read them, 513; Novels viewed from different points, 515; Who and what is the average novelist, 516; The same rules applied to newspaper men, 517; Conclusions drawn from the foregoing considerations, 518.	
<b>BEZA AS A TRANSLATOR; HIS PERVERSIONS OF THE WORD OF GOD.</b> By <i>Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.,</i> . . . . .	521
Luther's many imitators in the treatment of the Scriptures, 521; Theodore Beza one of the principal among them, 522; His private character, 523; His life as free as his verses, 524; How his young manhood was spent at Paris, 526; Flight to Geneva, 527; What has made his fame, 528; How the sense of the Bible may be explained or distorted, 529; Some specimens of his deliberate falsifications of the Bible, 530; The "Reformer's" idea of individual merit and free will, 531; Calvin's doctrines, 532; Teaching of the Catholic Church on these points, 534; The difficulties with which Beza met, 535; How he overcame some of them, 536; The doctrines of Redemption, 539; Some of his purposes, 541; The outside motive of Beza's doctrines, 543; His idea of justice, 545; No end to his wilful perversions, 546; Why Catholics reverence divine tradition, 548.	
<b>THE LOGIC OF EVOLUTION.</b> By <i>Rev. Edward F. X. McSweeney, D.D.,</i> . . . . .	551
"Laique" on Evolution, 551; The existence of God a fact, not an assumption, 552; Darwin's theory on the community of descent, 553; Transmission of certain traits, 553; Improvement in grade and the struggle for existence, 554; His reason for alleging a common origin for all animals, 555; Their adaptation to diversified conditions, 556; How man and the other animals are developed, 557; Dr. Draper on Evolution, 559; Sexual selection and the improvement of breeds, 560; To what Darwin's theory naturally leads, 561.	
<b>THE CANADIAN ELEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.</b> By <i>John Gilmory Shea, LL.D.,</i> . . . . .	581
Champlain and the Jesuit missionaries, 581; First explorers and the traces they have left, 582; Canadian settlers on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, 583; The primitive Canadian population has not become extinct, 584; This element during the war of Independence, 585; Settlements made after the war, 586; What has been done for the history of this element, 586; How the Canadians distinguished themselves, 587; Extracts from a new history, 588; How the volume opens, 589; Canadians rising to public places, 590; Milwaukee and its founder, 591; Dubuque and Peoria's discovery,	



# Table of Contents.

vii

	PAGE
592; The founder of Davenport, 593; Detroit, 593; Rainville and Provençal, 594; Fairbault and the Northwest Company, 595; Settlements in Minnesota and Dakota, 596; Mallet, Ménard, Bourbonnais, and others, 597; The late Senator Boggy, 598; French names in the Southwest, 599; Settlement of Oregon and Washington Territory, 600; Character of Canadian emigration to the United States, 601; What the Canadians have done and are doing for the religious, moral, and material progress of our country, 602; Canadian blood runs through the whole community, 603; What Catholic Canada is still doing, 604.	
<b>MODERN AND ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY COMPARED.</b> By <i>Rev. J. Ming, S. J.</i> , . . . . .	605
Return of Catholic Philosophy to the scholastic system, 605; In what Modern Philosophy consists and results, 606; Idealists and their forerunners, 607; The steps made by Kant, 608; His conclusions, 610; Fichte and his school, 613; In what his theory consists, 614; Development of his system, 615; Schelling, and what he taught, 616; His two series of development, 617; His theory of the absolute, 618; Last stage of his speculations, 619; How his philosophy was regarded, 620; Hegel's Idealism, 621; His ideas of morality and religion, 623; Bringing these to their last development, 625; Attacked by Schopenhauer and others, 626; Why it is useless to criticize these systems, 627.	
<b>DE LA SALLE: HIS LIFE AND WORK.</b> By <i>M. O'R.</i> , . . . . .	628
Social position of the De la Salle family, 628; Birth and education of the founder of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, 629; He loses his parents, 630; Devotedness to his favorite studies, 630; Determined to devote himself to the welfare of his neighbors, 631; He founds his Order, 632; In spite of difficulties he becomes the champion of popular education, 633; What he has done for the diffusion of knowledge, 634; Establishing a training school for teachers, 635; His work appreciated by the Government, 636; De la Salle eminent both for piety and learning, 637; His struggle with the Jansenists, 638; Progress of his work down to the Revolution, 639; Table showing the success of the Brothers of the Christian Schools as teachers, 640; Testimony of Guizot and Thiers, 641; Table of qualifying examinations for the University, 642; The ordeal through which the Brothers are now passing in France, 643.	
<b>RECENT PROGRESS IN STELLAR PHYSICS.</b> By <i>Rev. J. M. Degni, S. J.</i> , . . . . .	645
Astronomy leading the onward march of progress, 645; Use of the Spectroscope in this science, 647; Researches of Father Secchi and Prof. Lockyer, 648; Spectra of the various stellar types, 649; How the Spectroscope conveys a knowledge of the heavens, 650; What we have learned of the sun through it, 651; Progress of stellar chemistry, 653; Janssen and Lockyer observing the sun's prominences in full sunshine, 654; Further observations by their method, 655; Displacement of lines in the spectrum of the solar spots, 656; Doppler's principle, 657; Deductions regarding the nucleus of the sun, 658; Solution of questions regarding the stellar spectra, 659; Secchi's explanation of the stellar types, 660; Temperature of the stars, 661; Angular displacement of many fixed stars, 661; Velocity of the stars and other questions solved, 662; Spectroscopic observations on the variable stars, 663; Importance of the work accomplished by the Spectroscope, 663.	
<b>THE MORMONS.</b> By <i>Gen. John Gibbon, U. S. A.</i> , . . . . .	664
First acquaintance with Mormonism, 664; Leaving Utah to take part in the Civil War, 665; An instance illustrating the moral tone of the Mormon community, 666; Bargaining with a Mormon horse thief, 668; Receiving news of the battle of Bull Run, 669; Resuming rambles in the Rocky Mountains, and renewing the acquaintance of Mormonism, 670; Establishing Camp Douglass, 671; Character of Salt Lake and the streams that flow into it, 672; A Mormon as a citizen of the United States, 673; Brigham Young's influence, 674; An acquaintance in Cottonwood Cañon, 675; Ignorance characteristic of the Mormons, 676; The Mountain Meadow Massacre, 677; Workings of Government in Utah, 678; Death of Brigham Young, 679.	
<b>THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF RUSSIA.</b> By <i>A. de G.</i> , . . . . .	680
Interest awakened by the Nihilist movement, 680; Influence of Russia on Europe, 681; Last Russo-Turkish war, 681; Origin of the present discontent in Russia, 682; The army under the surveillance of the police, 683; Number and social composition of the Revolutionists, 684; Grim reality of the grievances of Russian society, 685; Present condition of Russia examined, 686; The Russo-Greek Church, 687; What Peter the Great and Catharine II. did, 688; Russian ideas on women and children, 689; How despotism has remained in Russia, 690; The Russians of to-day not so badly instructed, 691; A Nihilist Constitution, 692; Present condition of Russia explained, 692; History of Russia a warning to so-called Christian peoples, 693.	
<b>CARDINAL POLE.</b> By <i>Rev. M. J. McLoughlin</i> , . . . . .	694
Cardinal Pole's place in history, 694; His birth and family, 695; He is sent to Padua, 696; His first relations with Henry VIII, 697; Selected by Henry for the See of York, 699; He refuses, and the King's anger in consequence, 700; Patronized by Vittoria Colonna, 701; Declaration of the Royal supremacy, 702; Pole's absence from England no assurance against persecution, 703; A book which subjects him to the cruellest persecution by Henry, 704; His personal safety endangered, 705; Pole's influence on the Catholic world of that day, 706; His career as a Legate, 707; Council of Trent called, 709; What he did at the accession of Edward VI, 711; Marriage of Mary Tudor to Philip of Spain, 712; How the union was accepted in England, 713; Cardinal Pole and Queen Mary, 714; How he spent the last years of his life, 715; His character as an administrator, 716; Misunderstood by the good, 717; He was morally rather than mentally a great man, 718.	
<b>THE RECENT ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE LEO XIII.</b> By <i>Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.</i> , . . . . .	719
On the necessity of reinstating the Christian philosophy of St. Thomas in Catholic schools, 719; Latin text of the Encyclical, 733; English translation, 745.	

## BOOK NOTICES.

Allen & Greenough's Latin Grammar.....	388, 772	Jesuits, The, their Foundation and History	577
Anglo-American Bible Revision.....	580	Jesu Cristo se non e vero Dio vero Uomo.....	580
Bible History for the Use of Schools.....	772	La Nouvelle Atala.....	580, 767
Bismarck in the Franco-German War.....	385	Last Seven Words.....	191
Boardman's Epiphanies of the Risen Lord.....	580	Legouvé's Art of Reading.....	578
Brennan's Life of Christ.....	770	Leighton's Latin Lessons.....	388, 772
Cape's The Age of the Antonines.....	388	Lessons in Practical Science.....	578
Counterpoints in Canon Law. By Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.....	370	Louisa Kirkbride (Thébaud).....	573
Creation, The Six Days of the.....	382	Luytelaar's Fidel et Morum Fundamenta, 388, 771	
Crown of Thorns, The Mystery of the.....	388	Mazzella De Virtutibus Infusis.....	768
Cultivation of the Senses.....	579	Mallock's Is Life Worth Living?.....	769
Dawn of History (Keary).....	384	Memorie Documentale per la Storia della Rivoluzione Italiana.....	579
De Augustinis's De Re Sacramentaria.....	185, 770	Modern Chromatics.....	576
De Concilio's Elements of Intellectual Philosophy.....	177	Month of Mary.....	388
Development of English Literature (Brother Azarias).....	759	Motives of Life.....	387
Education as a Science.....	383	Mystery of the Wizard Chip.....	580
English Reformation, The (Geikie).....	388	Natural Resources of the United States.....	388
Essays from the North American Review.....	580	New Testament, translation from the Syriac	387
Ewer's Gentle Remonstrance.....	579	O'Brien's History of the Mass.....	571
Fairy-Land of Science, The.....	388	Ocean Wonders.....	388
Faith and Rationalism (Fisher).....	514	O'Connell's Catholicity in the Carolinas and Georgia.....	515
French Revolutionary Epoch, The.....	182	Onderdonk's History of Maryland.....	191
Grade und Freiheit.....	560	O'Reilly's Moondyne.....	572
Grammar of English Grammars.....	386	Protestant and Catholic Civilization Com- pared (De Haulleville).....	188
Green's History of the English People.....	569	Raphaëla.....	192
Haeckel's Evolution of Man.....	567	Religion, Lectures on the Origin and Growth of.....	388
Health Primers.....	388	Reply of Rt. Rev. Bishop Becker.....	187
Health and how to Preserve it.....	387	Richardson's Long Life and how to Reach it	580
Henriette d'Osseville, McLeod's Life of.....	190	Short Catechism for Young Men and Young Women Contemplating Marriage.....	192
Herbert Spencer's Data of Ethics.....	772	Solemn Blessing and Opening of the New Cathedral of New York.....	580
Human Species, The (De Quatrefages).....	765	Spirit of St. Francis of Sales.....	577
Ihne's Early Rome.....	388	States of the Christian Life and Vocation.....	388
Inner Life of Père Lacordaire.....	562	St. Louis University, Historical Sketch of.....	771
Introductio in Scripturam Sacram (Ubaldi)	388, 762	Taylor's Destruction and Reconstruction.....	388
Jesuits, The (Féval).....	189	The Multitudinous Seas.....	388

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

Vol. IV.—JANUARY, 1879.—No. 13.

---

## THEORIES OF EDUCATION AND OF LIFE.

THOMAS CARLYLE.

TO write a perfect logic, it would be necessary to write a perfect treatise on man; and a complete theory of education would be a complete philosophy of human nature. The aim and end of education is to bring out and strengthen man's faculties, physical, intellectual, and moral; to call into healthful play his manifold capacities; and to promote also with due subordination their harmonious exercise; and thus to fit him to fulfil his high and heaven-given mission, and to attain his true destiny. This would seem to be simple enough, and the most opposite schools of thought would probably find this statement sufficiently large to embrace all their differences. Nevertheless the subject of education is among the most involved and difficult, as it is among those which bear most directly upon the highest and holiest interests of mankind. The difficulty comes in part from the nature of man, which is complex. By thought he belongs to the world of intellect; by will to the moral world; his body makes him brother to the sluggish clod; his soul gives him companionship with angels, and the whole circumstance of his existence involves him in the most complicated relations with his fellow-beings. There is not merely diversity in his endowments, but contrariety.

The difficulty increases when we come to consider the modifications produced by his surroundings;—the ever-varying and counter-acting influences which affect his character; and yet, in such manner that to assign to each cause its proper effect in the total result is impossible. Again, the phases of human nature in the same

VOL. IV.—I



individual are so various; the types of collective bodies of men, so dissimilar; the features of the different national characters, so unlike; the effects produced by the same cause upon the same person, at different times, so opposite; the force of climate, of physical constitution, and even of the most trivial accidental circumstances, so marked and yet so little subject to human foresight, that, taken collectively, these facts of themselves seem to show, that the question of man's perfect and complete education is most intricate and involved. No one has a clear knowledge of the history even of his own life; of the causes of his progress and retrogression; of the influences that surrounded the birth of his affections and the cradle of his thoughts; of the motives that impelled him in this direction or in that. Were it possible to see ourselves as we are, it would yet be impossible to see clearly the causes which have made us what we are. Religious faith; the circumstances of birth and country; the national institutions and literature; the scenes and occupations of childhood; habits, whether good or evil, formed in youth; these and a thousand other influences, often obscure and difficult to trace, go to mould a human character.

There are persons who have been confirmed in virtue by having the bitterness of sin and the folly of wrongdoing brought home to them by sad experience. Others, on the contrary, having once gone astray, never return to the right path, but wander and ever wander, as though, like our first parents, by a first fall, their very nature had been tainted. Who can determine the influence of temperament and of inherited disposition in any given character? And yet this influence ought to be kept in view by the educator. There are natures which are strengthened and ennobled by a discipline, which would weaken and degrade those whose endowments are of a different kind. What fine discernment and deep insight are needed to bring out the antagonistic faculties without permitting them to clash and mutilate one another. The mechanical trade which requires the use of the arms alone, gives to them an abnormal strength at the expense of other members of the body, and thus destroys the symmetry and beauty of the human frame. Excess of physical exercise diminishes the power to think; and great devotion to intellectual culture has a tendency, not only to weaken the body, but to enfeeble the strength of moral conviction also, and consequently to undermine the basis of all true character. The pure intellect is not the sufficient measure of the reality of things, and overweening confidence in its power leads to skepticism. In the same way the development of the will and of moral consciousness, without corresponding mental enlightenment, may beget superstition and fanaticism,—“the zeal which is not of knowledge.” Even in the same faculty there is such a diversity of opera-

tion, that the education of the intellect or of the conscience alone, if we could consider them as isolated, would still be most difficult. Imagination is developed at the expense of judgment; the power of analysis interferes with the more wholesome synthetic operations of the mind; and metaphysical intuition is often found in inverse ratio to common sense. Equilibrium of moral character is not more easily produced. Considered in themselves, the virtues all conspire to form the perfect man; but the limitations of human nature prevent this ideal harmony; and hence, we find that courage interferes with meekness, independence with humility, generosity with economy, and confidence with prudence. The difficulty then is manifest, and it is also evident that no system can be devised by which a perfect education will be secured. And, in fact, to trust greatly to any educational mechanism is a dangerous illusion. Growth of soul is a spiritual process, and can be promoted only by spiritual agencies. Man, and not the school system, is the true educator; and to believe that machinery so powerful within its own sphere, is also able to form worthy men and women, is a gross superstition. It is none the less true, however, that education can not be carried on without the aid of mechanical appliances; and hence, the necessity of systems, and of attempts to realize them. Every system of education is based upon a theory, which is derived from views concerning man's nature and destiny. What is man? What ought he to be? What is his chief business in this life? Has he a destiny beyond this life? If so, has his conduct in this life a bearing upon his future state? These are questions which necessarily come up for consideration when we attempt to form a theory of education; and this theory will be shaped by the answers which we accept. A system of education is, in fact, the expression of a universal philosophy, embracing God, man, and nature; and hence, nothing throws more light upon the real thought of an age than its views upon this subject. An attentive examination of this matter will not only reveal what men really hold to be true, but it will also bring out, as in relief, the relative importance which they attach to their professed beliefs, and the strength of conviction with which they hold them.

In illustration, we will first revert to the classic nations, whose religion was a kind of nature-worship, and who, though they believed in a future existence, looked upon this life as alone joyous and happy. Hellenic religion, which had its origin in the deification of nature, found its highest expression in the state, whose tutelary divinities were the heroes by whom it had been founded or successfully defended. The state was absolute and supreme; and man's first duty and privilege was to be of service to his country. The future life was to be cheerless in the land of shadows

and gloom ; here we drink in the blessed light and air of heaven ; here is the green earth, here the flowing waters, here all things invite to joy.

In accordance with these views of man and life, education among the Greeks, is patriotic and æsthetic. In Sparta, the sole aim is to discipline the man into the perfect soldier, and at Athens an element of culture and refinement is added, which is opposed to the warlike temper and the influence of which led to the decay of Grecian civilization. The moral education which teaches the individual that he has duties and responsibilities which transcend his earthly sphere, and which make him accountable to an infinite Being, and an order of things which is eternal, was neglected. In his noblest work Plato has left us an elaborate theory of education, in which he sacrifices both the freedom of the individual and the rights of the family to the state.

With the Romans, too, the state was supreme ; but their character was more serious and practical than that of the cheerful and pleasure-loving Greeks. And hence, to the military training which prepared them to win victories for their country, was added a juristic education which taught them to watch jealously over their rights. When by the conquest of Greece, they were brought into contact with æsthetic culture, it was again found incompatible with the patriotic and military temper, and gradually undermined Roman as it had destroyed Grecian civilization. Religion was held to be a function of the state, and hence religious education was made subordinate and auxiliary to the patriotic spirit. Man's first and highest duty was to his country ; and both the individual and the family were sacrificed to the state. Hellenism is negatively characterized by want of moral earnestness. The Greek is intellectually active ; is eager to see things as they are, and finds the most childlike and real delight in whatever is beautiful ; but he has no sense of sin, no awful consciousness of God's presence and holiness. He argues and disputes ; creates philosophy and poetry and all the arts, but perishes for having failed to perceive the paramount importance of conduct. His desire to see things as they are, degenerates into sophistry ; his love of the beautiful becomes sensuality ; and he himself remains an eternal example of the impotence of the noblest endowments, where there is no basis of moral earnestness and religious faith.

Judaism took a different view of man, and consequently formed a different theory of education. The idea of God, the Creator of all things, and wholly free from the control of nature, is the dominant thought of Hebraism. Hence man's primal duty is not to deified personifications of natural forces, but to God, who loves righteousness and hates iniquity ; whose will is law, and its fulfil-

ment blessedness; and its violation, which is sin, the only evil and supreme misery. Nature is no longer independent and self-existent, as in the Greek's conception, but a creature, and hence the Hebrew is freed from her control, and loves and fears God alone. Far from adoring as divine, the beauty revealed in nature, he flees from it as a temptation to idolatry. For a similar reason, the state can not be absolute and supreme, and prominence is given to the family. Education is patriarchal and religious, and is directed chiefly to morality.

To illustrate still further the manner in which the theory of education conforms to the generally accepted ideal of man, let us turn from the consideration of national types to the class type.

In the Middle Ages, the most characteristic figures are the knight and the monk. The ideal of chivalry is free military service in behalf of Christendom, and consequently in behalf of all who are wronged and oppressed; and among these, woman takes precedence by virtue of the supreme charm with which she appeals to the heart of man. With a view to fit him for this noble career, the boy, when he was seven years old, began to learn the manner of offensive and defensive warfare, on foot and on horseback; and between his sixteenth and eighteenth year he was raised to knighthood by a formal ceremony. His intellectual education was neglected, as having nothing to do with the main purpose of his life. His hand was to hold the sword and not the pen; and even in modern times we find, in proportion as the aristocratic spirit is powerful, a want of mental flexibility and openness to ideas in the nobility. Great development was given to the moral qualities which go to form the knightly character, especially courage and the sense of honor. To be a true knight, was to be *sans peur et sans reproche*. The exaggerated notion of the worth of courage and the extreme sensibility to honor, which were fostered by this education, led to the fantastic extravagancy of knighthood, and finally degenerated into vagabondism and quixotism, which were the harbingers of the decline and dissolution of chivalry.

The ideal of monasticism is free spiritual service in behalf of Christendom, and consequently in behalf of all who are wronged and oppressed or weak and helpless, and especially of the slave and the poor. The monk is the chevalier of the soul. Obedience takes the place of fealty, poverty gives the right and the power to speak words of hope and consolation to those who have nothing, and charity elevates to a spiritual and free kingdom, where the fetters that bind the wedded are unknown, and where there is yet the most intense and real love. And so obedience is not the negation of liberty; nor poverty, of work; nor chastity, of the family. The ideal monk realizes heaven more truly than earth, is more

conscious of his soul than of his body or his mind. Hence, his education is primarily spiritual and unworldly. He loves solitude and silence, meditates much upon the vanity of life, the certainty of death, and the unreality of all earthly hopes. His thoughts are in eternity with God, and the great world-drama of human life seems to him like a phantasmagoria. He studies, but learning is made subordinate to spiritual progress; he labors, but not that he may enrich himself, but that he may teach the idle to work, and that he may have wherewith to help the poor. His education is interfered with or made impossible when the monastic state is lifted out of humility and poverty by the gratitude and love of the people or the munificence of princes, or when he abandons the seclusion of his cloister to mingle in worldly affairs.

Education is the effort to create the ideal man, whether absolutely or relatively to special vocations, and hence the theory will conform to the received notions concerning this ideal. When the first requisite of a perfect man is thought to be a strong and athletic body, gymnastic exercise will take precedence of intellectual training; when the chief good is held to be an enlightened mind, mental activity will be stimulated, even though the body should suffer. Again, each vocation will have its special education. The training of the soldier will be different from that of the lawyer; the physician will not be educated like the priest. A fashionable mother, who thinks woman's vocation is to please and to be pleased, will send her daughter to a school of manners, where she will be taught the graces and accomplishments of artificial and frivolous society. The unlikeness of the different special educations arises from the dissimilar ideals of the various vocations. Knowledge, whether got in a military academy or a commercial college, is equally good, but knowledge is not education. Habits of thought and of life are more than knowledge, and the habits which are necessarily acquired during the process of education may render knowledge useless or hurtful. Every educated man knows much that may be to his advantage in any position, but in getting this knowledge he has probably formed habits which, in avocations different from the one for which he has been trained, will be of greater injury than his learning of help. And hence our American axiom, that "knowledge is power," is fallacious. The soldier has doubtless learned many things which the tradesman ought to know, but he has also conceived a notion of life, of honor, of the value of courage, as compared with other qualities, which, were he forced to become a merchant, would prove to be obstacles to his success.

"An Oxford education," says Mr. Froude, "fits a man extremely well for the trade of gentleman. I do not know for what other trade it does fit him as at present constituted. More than one man



who has taken high honors there, who has learnt faithfully all that the university undertakes to teach him, has been seen in these late years breaking stones upon a road in Australia." A better stone-breaker he would doubtless be had he never studied at Oxford.

An illustration of the truth upon which I am here insisting is furnished by American society. A scientific education gives to the farmer knowledge which he can put to practical use in a thousand ways. Chemistry, zoology, botany, physiology, mineralogy, and physics generally, may in his hands be converted into money. Shall we not, then, give to every farmer a scientific education? No; for the habits of thought and sentiment which such education creates would render farm life distasteful to him, and in fact, we find in our own country that even a little education tends to drive the young men from tillage of the land to the shop life of towns and cities, or, worse still, into the learned professions, and our agricultural colleges train young men for everything except the end for which they were organized.

It can hardly be necessary to insist further upon the essential relation which exists between the theory of human destiny and the theory of human education. The question, what education shall I give my child? can be answered only by asking another question, what do you desire your child to be and to do? The accepted end of man determines the aim of the educator and prescribes his system. Now there are two radically different ways of viewing human life, and but two. We may consider it as complete in this world, or as preparatory to a higher state of existence, and corresponding to these opposite views we have the secular and the religious theories of education. If there is no future life, a system of education based upon the recognition of such life must be false and hurtful. The human mind in matters of this kind refuses to accept arguments drawn from expediency. To hold that there is no God and no immortal human soul, and yet to educate men to believe in God and in the soul from a notion that such teaching has a social value, is an outrage. Rather let the race perish than be kept alive by an infinite lie and worldwide imposture. On the other hand, to hold that God is and that the soul is immortal, and yet to refuse to make the system of education conformable to this belief, is an outrage; and here again the human mind refuses to accept arguments drawn from expedience. Whether or not this kind of education will best serve the cause of what is called civilization and progress, is of small moment. If God is, He is first, He is all in all; if the soul is, it is more than civilization and progress.

These two opposite views of human life are in fatal antagonism, and there can be no thought of compromise; they give form and character to the two hostile armies in the eternal warfare between

spirit and matter, the temporal and the eternal, the Christ and the world. That the view, whose horizon is bounded by man's present life is widely accepted, there can be no doubt. It has its philosophy, its ethics, its political economy, its sociology, its pedagogy, and hopes to have its religion. It is not a happy or joyful belief, yet it is full of confidence and eager courage, a confidence and a courage born not of an accidental or a casual insight into the nature of things, but of a range of thought which embraces the universe, which weighs the atom and the sun, which meditates devoutly upon the life of the animalcule and seeks to trace it in uninterrupted ascent to man, which studies with a courage that never despairs the most hidden nerve-force, hoping against hope that it will yet detect it breaking into thought and soul life. It has not the mocking and frivolous temper of Voltaire, nor the satanic mood of Byron. So wide has its thought grown, that fanaticism is almost impossible. As Schiller grieved over the dead gods of Greece, this new philosophy is filled with the quiet sorrow of fatalism in contemplating the old faith. There is a kind of exultation as the light breaks in upon the hidden mysteries of nature, but in every cry of triumph there is an undertone of sadness, almost of despair, as from a half-conscious feeling that the end of all is death and darkness and nothingness, so that what began as the most self-satisfied optimism, now fatally turns to pessimism, which is the protest of the unbelieving soul against sensualism and atheism.

Let us trace the theoretical development of this earth-creed, and then study its historical manifestation, in so far as it bears upon the question of education and man's destiny. I shall not go further back than Kant, who is the father of the critical philosophy, and who gave the impulse to the intellectual movement, which, outside the Church, is bearing the modern mind farther and farther away from metaphysics. It was he who first inspired a profound distrust of whatever is beyond the sphere of experience; and who relegated to the region of the unknown the reality which underlies the phenomenon. The result of his thinkings is this: The phenomenon alone can be known; the *nommenon* is not cognoscible.

The human reason is involved in radical contradictions whenever it attempts to dogmatize concerning God, the soul, and the universe; and hence arise, by a necessary process, the paralogisms of theology, the gratuitous hypotheses of psychology and the antinomies of cosmology. Here we have the essential principles of the Positivism of Compté, and of the Cosmism of Herbert Spencer—absolute condemnation of metaphysics, skepticism concerning the operations of our highest faculties, and the elimination of all reality which is not perceived by the senses.

The influence of Hegel, which has been so profoundly felt by

the modern world, is in the same direction. The identity of being and not being; the personality of God, an absurdity unworthy of the attention of serious thinkers; the efficient and final cause of the world immanent in the world; nothing is, but everything is becoming; truth and reality consequently nothing absolute, but fugitive forms of what neither is, nor is not—a kind of intellectual star-dust, which is not nothing nor anything. These are some of the characteristic doctrines of Hegelian pantheism, and whatever else may be thought of them, they unmistakably confine the life of man to this world, which is its own efficient and final cause. The universe is an eternal flow, in which truth and beauty and goodness, are but the changeful waves that float upon the great world-current of matter. Each fact, each individual, is a point of momentary rest in the midst of universal mobility.

In this system religion has but an accidental value, and the interest which it inspires is chiefly historical and psychological. The forms in which man has clothed his dreams of the divine are curious as an archæological study or as a branch of ethnology. The vulgar and passionate polemics of Protestantism and rationalism are obsolete. Nothing is false or in bad taste, but dogmatism. Christianity is man's highest effort to give form and body to the infinite, and when criticism shall have finally done away with all its dogmas, it will be left to the inspirations of the heart, to be transformed indefinitely to suit the requirements of progress and civilization. There is no God, but there are divine things,—culture, liberty and love. This is the religion of sentiment, so familiar to us Americans, so frequent upon the lips of eloquent preachers, for whom it were charitable to pray, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." This is the soil in which the religion of humanity flourishes: the worship of man taking the place of the worship of God. In the beginning there is no God, there is nothing, only a becoming; in the end, there is man. He is the highest, let us serve him. And since the individual is but a bubble that bursts and remerges in the general air, a snow-drop, remelting into the element from which it was assumed and congealed into separateness, let him dwindle and let the race be more and more. Let the weak perish, let the fittest survive, let all things belong to the strong. This is the eternal law of our sacred mother, Nature, who alone is supreme. An ideal humanity, truly, is only an abstraction; it does not exist, it will never exist; it is but a phantom. The individual is contemptible. The race is found only in the individual. All this is undeniable. But what will you have? Our hypothesis excludes God, and this phantom of humanity is all that remains to persuade us that to eat and to drink is not the only wisdom. In this system too, the

religion of pantheistic mysticism, the faith of Mr. Carlyle and of Mr. Emerson, finds its justification. Pantheism is obscure and nebular, and mysticism loves the uncertain light of a symbolical and oracular phraseology, and when the two are combined, it is not easy to seize the real thought. The thought, however, is pantheistic, the mood is mystic. The central idea, upon which the thousand changes of poetic and prophetic rhapsody are rung, and from which also proceed objurgation, scorn, anger, indignation, withering contempt, whether in the jolting, interrupted, epigrammatic style of Mr. Emerson, or in the tumultuous, turgid, apodictic manner of Mr. Carlyle, is Hegelian Pantheism. For both the efficient and final cause of the world is immanent in the world, and the transcendentalism is modal and accidental. To both, systems and creeds are hateful, and to be "a swallower of formulas" is the highest glory. As there is no absolute truth, there is no permanent symbol. To be spontaneous, original, and strong, is the only merit. The world's great men know no other law than the fatality of their genius. To be weak is, as Milton says, the true misery.

"Thus," says Mr. Carlyle, "like some wild-flaming, wild-thundering train of Heaven's artillery, does this mysterious MANKIND thunder and flame in long-drawn, quick-succeeding grandeur through the unknown deep. Thus like a God-created, fire-breathing spirit-host, we emerge from the inane, haste stormfully across the astonished earth, then plunge again into the inane." A rushing forth from nothing back into nothing—this is all. The educator's business is to prepare man to make this stormful haste across the astonished earth in a becoming manner.

Pedagogy cannot aspire to fit him for an existence in the inane. For this life must man be educated; of another, if other there be, neither knowledge nor faith can give us true account. The hero of Mr. Carlyle's profoundest and most eloquent work, walks wearisomely through this world, having lost all tidings of another and higher. Fixed, starless, tartarean darkness envelops his soul. "The everlasting NO had said: 'Behold, thou art fatherless, outcast, and the universe is mine.'" The hero made answer: "I am not thine, but free, and forever hate thee." This wild protest against despair leads him to the Centre of Indifference, from which in grim mockery he hurls his objurgations: "God," he says, "must needs laugh outright, could such a thing be, to see his wondrous manikins here below." He is in the wilderness; it is the wide world in an atheistic century.

Lying here in this Centre of Indifference he awakes to a new heaven and a new earth. From a high table-land he gazes upon the world and contemplates its myriadfold and ever-changing forms

of beauty and life. "How thou fermentest," he exclaims, "and elaboratest in thy great fermenting vat and laboratory of an atmosphere, of a world. Oh, nature! or, what is nature? Ha! Why do I not name thee God? Art not thou the 'living garment of God?' Oh, Heavens, is it, in very deed, He, then, that ever speaks through thee; that lives and loves in thee, that lives and loves in me?"

And to this pantheism the spirit of mysticism comes to seek a new worship. The Mythos of Christianity is obsolete. "The temple thereof, founded some eighteen centuries ago, now lies in ruins, overgrown with jungle, the habitation of doleful creatures." A worship and an ideal nevertheless must be found. Speculation is by nature endless, formless, a vortex amid vortices. Thought fatally leads to the abyss in which all things whirl in inextricable confusion, and in which nothing can be seen or known with certainty; for in the lowest deep a lower depth still opening, swallows the thinker and his thought, beyond plummet's sounding, yea, beyond the reach of fantasy. The end of life, therefore, is not to think but to act. Not that we might in morbid self-introspection eat our own hearts; projecting upon the world we rail at our diseased imaginations, have we emerged from the inane. Goethe is right. His immortal precept opens a new era and founds a new religion. Study, he says, how to live; that is, study how to make the most of life. "Fool! the ideal is in thyself, the impediment too is in thyself; thy condition is but the stuff thou art to shape that same ideal out of; what matters whether such stuff be of this sort or that, so the form thou give it be heroic, be poetic? O thou that pinest in the imprisonment of the actual, and criest bitterly to the gods for a kingdom wherein to rule and create, know this of a truth. The thing thou seekest is already with thee, 'here or nowhere,' couldst thou only see." Here or nowhere, study how to make the most of life. This is the path that leads upward from tartarean darkness and endless chaos to the light and serenity of cosmic harmony. Mr. Carlyle, most assuredly, is no materialist, he is no utilitarian; and just as little is he a sensualist or a scientific atheist. Against all these things his soul cries out in fiery and convulsive indignation. What an imperishable odor is there not in those "pig propositions" in which he gives us the materialist and utilitarian theory of the world? The universe is an immeasurable swine's trough. Moral evil is unattainability of pig's wash. Paradise, called also, state of innocence, age of gold, was unlimited attainability of pig's wash. It is the mission of universal pignood, and the duty of all pigs, at all times, to diminish the quantity of unattainable, and increase that of attainable. All knowledge and device and effort ought to be directed thither, and thither only.

Pig poetry ought to consist of universal recognition of the excellence of pig's wash and ground barley, and the felicity of pigs whose trough is in order, and who have had enough. Humph! Who made the pig? Unknown;—perhaps the pork butcher.

The cold and pitiless irony of Swift is here seething hot, like molten lava.

Scientific atheism, too, with its superficial and self-conceited rationalism, fills him with contempt, in which there is also an element of fiery anger. "Thou wilt have no mystery and mysticism, he exclaims; wilt walk through thy world by the sunshine of what thou callest truth, or even by the hand-lamp of what I call attorney-logic, and 'explain' all, 'account' for all, or believe nothing of it. Nay, thou wilt attempt laughter; whoso recognizes the unfathomable, all-pervading domain of mystery, which is everywhere, under our feet and among our hands; to whom the universe is an oracle and temple, as well as a kitchen and cattle-stall—he shall be a delirious mystic; to him, thou, with sniffing charity, wilt protrusively proffer thy hand-lamp and shriek, as one injured when he kicks his foot through it." The universe is awful, mysterious. "Thy daily life is girt with wonder, and based on wonder; thy very blankets and breeches are miracles." The unspeakable divine significance lies in all things. "Atheistic science babbles poorly of it, with scientific nomenclatures, experiments, and what not, as if it were a poor dead thing to be bottled up in Leyden jars and sold over counters. But the natural sense of man, in all times, if he will honestly apply his sense, knows it to be a living thing,—ah, an unspeakable, Godlike thing, towards which the best attitude for us after never so much science, is awe, devout prostration and humility of soul; worship, if not in words, then in silence." This indignant rebuke to atheism proceeds from a fervent soul. Impiety is offensive to Mr. Carlyle, to whom whatever is, is divine, is God. All religions he holds are good, if only men are sincere. The only idolatry is that from which the sentiment has departed. To worship sticks and stones with all one's heart and in downright honesty, is better than all the conventional pieties of our modern world. The value of religion is purely subjective; it is in the sentiment. The object is of small moment, for all possible symbols are but representations of the mysterious unknown which lies beneath appearance. But for Mr. Carlyle, as for all, who deny the existence of a personal God, man is the highest; and his religion is hero-worship. His view is fixed upon this life alone; he knows no other. Here or nowhere. Man rushes forth from nothing back into nothing. To educate him for a future life, would be as absurd as to educate him for a past life. In fact, as he had no past life, so will he have no future life. Study, therefore, to make the most of

this; and to teach this highest and only wisdom, should be the educator's aim and purpose. Mr. Carlyle, however, has no faith in any mechanism or system of education. A gerund-grinding pedagogue is to him no better than the wood and leather man, whom the Nurembergers were to build, and "who should reason as well as most country parsons." The curse of the age is its belief in mechanism. The soul of man, the soul of society, the soul of religion, is come to be considered the product of mechanical action. If the wheels, cogs, valves, pistons, and checks are in order, all is well. Man's happiness and worth are no longer believed to be within himself; his ideal is not a spiritual and divine something, but an outward condition, in which there will be a well-oiled and smoothly working machine for manufacturing everything; from patent creeds and codes to patent breeches. This is atheism, this is infinite evil, infinite despair, and no religion. "We have forgotten God," he says, "in the most modern dialect and very pith of the matter, we have taken up the fact of this universe as it *is not*. We have quietly closed our eyes to the eternal substance of things, and opened them only to the shows and shams of things. We quietly believe the universe to be intrinsically a great unintelligible PERHAPS; extrinsically clear enough it is a great, most extensive cattlefold and workhouse, with most extensive kitchen ranges, dining tables,—whereat he is wise who can find a place! All the truth of this universe is uncertain; only the profit and loss of it, the pudding and praise of it, are and remain very visible to the practical man. There is no God any longer for us!. God's laws are become a greatest happiness principle, a parliamentary expediency; the heavens overarch us only as an astronomical time-keeper. . . . This is verily the plague-spot centre of the universal social gangrene, threatening all modern things with frightful death. To him that will consider it, here is the stem, with its roots and tap-root, with its world-wide upas-boughs and accursed poison exudations, under which the world lies writhing in atrophy and agony. You touch the fatal centre of all our disease, of our frightful nosology of diseases, when you lay your hand on this. "There is no religion; there is no God; man has lost his soul, and vainly seeks antiseptic salt." The blight of this faith in what is dead, godless and mechanic, corrupts our modern education, which regards only what is practical and economic, and wholly abandons to moral dry-rot man's spiritual and religious nature. The science of the age is physical, chemical, physiological. Even mathematics is valued only for its mechanic use, in building bridges, constructing forts, and indicating the proper angle for killing men at given distances. The inventor of the spinning-jenny and sewing-machine has his reward. The philosopher is without honor. Thought is



secreted by the brain; and poetry and religion are "a product of the smaller intestines." What other than a mechanical education is possible to men who breathe this mephitic, soul-stifling air? The mind is littered, as though it grew like a vegetable, with etymological and other compost; it is crammed with dead vocables; it is taught that its chief use is to calculate profit and loss; and when it is burnt out to a grammatical and arithmetical cinder, its education is complete.

"Alas, so is it everywhere, so will it ever be; till the hodman is discharged or reduced to hod-bearing; and an architect is hired, and on all hands fitly encouraged; till communities and individuals discover, not without surprise, that fashioning the souls of a generation by knowledge, can rank on a level with blowing their bodies to pieces by gunpowder; that with generals and field-marsals, for killing, there should be world-honored dignitaries, and were it possible, true God-ordained priests for teaching."

No hidebound pedant can educate. Of man, such a one knows only that he has a faculty called memory, and that it can be acted on through the muscular integument by birchen rods. To educate we must touch the mysterious springs of love, fear, and wonder, of enthusiasm, poetry, religion. These are the inward and vital powers of man; who cannot be roused into deep, all-pervading effort by any computable prospect of profit and loss, for any definite finite object, but only for what is invisible and infinite. "When we can drain the ocean into our mill-ponds, and bottle up the force of gravity, to be sold by retail in our gas-jars, then may we hope to comprehend the infinitudes of man's soul under formulas of profit and loss; and rule over this too, as over a patent engine, by checks and valves and balances."

One of Mr. Carlyle's great merits, is the vividness and force with which he brings out man's spiritual nature; his craving for the infinite; his inborn and necessary dissatisfaction with whatever is not eternal and all-perfect. Out of the meanness and littleness and emptiness of the world which surrounds him, he takes refuge in the eternities, the immensities, the veracities. It is at least singular that the most gifted and earnest writers of the England of the nineteenth century, in spite of their innumerable differences in thought and temper, should agree in their estimate of English life. That it is low and vulgar, selfish and insincere, without high ideals or generous impulses or noble aspirations, is the common testimony of Mr. Carlyle and John Stuart Mill, of Dickens and Thackeray, of Byron and Mr. Tennyson, of Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Matthew Arnold. Macaulay, indeed, is inclined to optimistic views in whatever concerns England, but he is purely literary; lives on the surface, which he rounds off with a polished and ornate phrase, and leaves untouched the deep central heart of things.

What gloomy energy is there not in the following words of Mr. Carlyle !

" Like the valley of Jehoshaphat it lies round us, one nightmare wilderness, and wreck of dead men's bones, this false modern world ; and no rapt Ezekiel imaged to himself things sadder, more horrible and terrible, than the eyes of men, if they are awake, may now deliberately see."

And in these other words, what depth of truth is there not discernible !

" Faith strengthens us, enlightens us, for all endeavors and endurances ; with faith we can do all, and dare all, and life itself has a thousand times been joyfully given away. But the sum of man's misery is even this, that he feel himself crushed under the Juggernaut wheels, and know that Juggernaut is no divinity, but a dead mechanical idol."

And again, the angry voice breaks forth in sullen, almost despairing protest :

" Not Godhead, but an iron, ignoble circle of necessity embraces all things ; binds the youth of these times into a sluggish thrall, or else exasperates him into a rebel. Heroic action is paralyzed ; for what worth now remains unquestionable with him ? At the fervid period, when his whole nature cries aloud for action, there is nothing sacred under whose banner he can act ; the course and kind and conditions of free action are all but undiscoverable. Doubt storms in on him through every avenue ; inquiries of the deepest painfulest sort must be engaged with ; and the invincible energy of young years waste itself in skeptical, suicidal cavillings, in passionate questionings of destiny, whence no answer will be returned."

The weakness, the shallowness, the misery and selfishness which are the results of atheism and no-religion, are most clearly discerned and forcibly expressed by Mr. Carlyle. He sees that faith is something higher than himself, is the one thing needful for man ; that to live for vulgar objects and selfish ends, is suicidal, is the denial and destruction of all that makes life worth having ; and when men come with their schemes for making this earth a luxurious lubberland, where the brooks shall run wine, and the trees bend with ready-baked viands, and who bring their hand-lamp wherewith to dispel all darkness, he, without more ado, kicks his foot through it, and so leaves them and their paper contrivances. He has the gift of noble indignation. His very soul loathes all sham ; he is the sworn enemy of cant, and holds sincerity to be the mother virtue. The sincere man is the divine man, the hero, the highest form which consciousness can assume. He comes to us at first hand, with tidings from the infinite unknown. The words he speaks are no other man's words : he comes from the inner fact of things, the heart of the world, the primal reality. That the hero have what men call faults is of small moment. We make too much of faults, says Mr. Carlyle. He is all fault who has no fault.

Hence Mahomet, Luther, Cromwell, Rousseau, Burns, and Napoleon, are not simply men of genius and power, but they are messengers from heaven, true prophets, to be received and heard with all reverence and obedience; nay, to be worshipped in all sincerity. "And in this so despicable age of ours,—be the bounteous heavens ever thanked for it,—two heroes have nevertheless been found. Bonaparte walked through the war-convulsed world like an all-devouring earthquake, heaving, thundering, hurling kingdom over kingdom. Goethe was as the mild-shining, inaudible light, which, notwithstanding, can again make that chaos into a creation." And now the bounteous heavens have to this so despicable age vouchsafed a third hero, who is no other than Prince Bismarck; and, to crown the work of mercy, they have inspired Mr. Froude to reveal to his generation the heroic character and sublime worth of that much-abused and misunderstood demigod, Henry VIII. And so we have verified Mr. Carlyle's doctrine that the age of miracles is not past, but even now is.

Upon those who, in this modern world, are called religious, Mr. Carlyle pours, in boundless contempt, the full vials of his scorn and wrath. They are unveracities, chimeras, and semblances. Even the best of them keep trucking and trimming between worn-out symbols and hypocrisy. . . . "Birds of darkness are on the wing, spectres uproar, the dead walk, the living dream." The church clothes, which once held and revealed to men's eyes the holy of holies, nothing else than the divine idea of the world, have now gone sorrowfully out at elbows. "Nay, far worse, many of them have become mere hollow shapes or masks, under which no living figure or spirit any longer dwells; but only spiders and unclean beetles, in horrid accumulation, drive their trade; and the mask still glares on you, with its glass eyes, in ghastly affectation of life." The religion of the Middle Ages is something quite different, nay, wholly opposite, a living and divine reality. "In those dark ages intellect could invent glass, which now she has enough ado to grind into spectacles. Intellect built not only churches, but a church, *the* church, based on this firm earth, yet reaching and leading up as high as heaven." This church was planted on the basis of fact, and built according to the laws of statics; and its heroes and prophets are troubled by no doubt, or any sort of doubt. Their "religion is not a diseased self-introspection, an agonizing inquiry; their duties are clear to them; the way of supreme good plain, indisputable, and they are travelling on it. Religion lies over *them* like an all-embracing heavenly canopy, like an atmosphere and life element, which is not spoken of, which, in all things, is presupposed without speech. Is not serene or complete religion the

highest aspect of human nature, as serene cant or complete no-religion is the lowest and miserablest?"

"Our religion," he says—speaking of what he calls "twelfth-century Catholicism"—"is not yet a horrible, restless doubt, still less a far horribler composed cant; but a great heaven-high unquestionability, encompassing, interpenetrating the whole of life."

In this old Church, planted on the basis of fact, built according to the laws of statics, heroes were not wanting. Here, for instance, is Abbott Samson: "The great antique heart, how like a child's in its simplicity, like a man's in its earnest solemnity and depth! Heaven lies over him wheresoever he goes or stands on the earth; making all the earth a mystic temple to him, the earth's business all a kind of worship. Heaven's splendor over his head, hell's darkness under his feet. It was not a dilettantism this of Abbott Samson. It was a reality, and it is one. . . . This is Abbott Samson's Catholicism of the twelfth century. Alas! compared with any of the isms current in these poor days, what a thing!"

No one could have written a nobler history of Gregory VII. and his creative work than Mr. Carlyle; nor could he have found a grander hero; but his temper, like Milton's, led him rather to the great destroyers and mighty rebels, who walk through the convulsed world, upheaving, casting down, blowing to fragments men and their works.

In his doctrine of hero-worship there are doubtless elements of truth. The highest man is most like to God of anything that is visible in this earth. God himself has walked the earth clothed on with human nature, and of his divine gifts men are the ministers. The soul of man is more than any or all machinery. For man's sake was the Sabbath instituted, and for him all good and right institutions exist; not he for them. He is more than they. True religion must not only inspire reverence for man, but must produce heroic types of men, saints of God, who in strong and painful wrestlings with themselves and the spirits of darkness, struggle upwards to peace and light, leaving behind them a pathway, red with blood, but luminous; so that the multitudes who grope in the gloom of lower thoughts and loves, may not be left without some living testimony and effulgence of the higher world, for which all alike have been created. Even God's sacraments fall into disuse unless they are held in the hands of true, believing men. Reverence for those who are above us is not only a Christian virtue, but one which in this day has special need of being preached. And admiration, too, is wholesome and elevating. I admire the gift even where I condemn its use. The shallow spirit, which sees no greatness in man and no great men, is irreligious. But Mr. Carlyle exaggerates the value and influence of hero-wor-

ship, and his ideal is not only false but immoral. "All religion," he says, "issues in due practical hero-worship. . . . Society is founded on hero-worship. . . . I seem to see in this indestructibility of hero-worship the everlasting adamant, lower than which the confused wreck of revolutionary things cannot fall." Of all this, what Mr. Carlyle would call attorney logic, and what here may fitly enough be called common sense, cannot approve. Nevertheless, even the logic-chopper must admit that it is fairly deducible from the premises. If man springs forth from the unconscious, as Mr. Carlyle holds, he can worship only himself; for the highest consciousness must necessarily think itself the absolute highest. In fact this whole system of hero-worship is but a development of Hegel's law of history, which is pantheistic. The ideal man, in this system, is in no true sense ideal. The sincere man is not the highest, best, wisest man; for fanaticism may be sincere as well as faith, and tyranny as well as justice. Moreover, sincerity, in Mr. Carlyle's thought, is synonymous with naturalness, and it may be urged with strong reason that goodness and virtue are not natural to man. Hence, Mr. Carlyle loses more and more all ground of difference between the *natural* and the *right*; his ideal grows less and less spiritual, until finally he fails to perceive any higher test of worth than sheer strength. Whatever can get upon its feet and stand there in spite of all enemies, is thereby self-consecrated, in his eyes, as a part of the eternal laws. The force which on its way to great achievements refuses to be controlled, the genius which acknowledges no law but itself, are not only wonderful but sacred and divine. Mahomet may be lustful, Cromwell cruel, Luther coarse and sensual, Burns a drunkard, Rousseau utterly abject; but to remark this is the most unmistakable proof that one is a blockhead. Let us bear in mind that Mr. Carlyle holds nature to be divine and all natural forces to be sacred, and we shall easily get at his point of view. These men are natural, and it is therefore simply absurd to suppose that they can be immoral. With what devout reverence and admiration does he not follow Mirabeau in his lust-defiled and madly reckless career? But the Count is natural, a swallower of formulas, a contemner of custom; and is not this divine, is it not the highest? Mr. Carlyle has some most eloquent passages on the quite infinite nature of duty, and Teufelsdröckh, even in the sorrowfullest wretchedness of unbelief, has still this light to convince him that the world is God's and not the devil's. But when we try to get at the exact import of duty, we cannot perceive that in his mind it means more than sincerity, naturalness. To this infinite nature of duty Mahomet, Cromwell, Mirabeau, and Frederick the Great were true; all men,

in fact, it would seem, are true; for "man cannot but obey whatever he ought to obey."

In *Sartor Resartus* there is no more striking passage than the following: "There is in man a higher than love of happiness; he can do without happiness, and instead thereof find blessedness! . . . Love not pleasure, love God. This is the everlasting Yea, wherein all contradiction is solved; wherein whoso walks and works, it is well with him."

Love God, says Mr. Carlyle, but does he mean God? In the multitudinous writings which have poured from his pen since that precept was recorded, it is not found, I think, a second time. Much and often has he spoken of the eternities, the immensities, the veracities, the silences, in whose presence we should stand in awe and wonder with devout prostration of soul. Much and often too has he spoken of the unconscious, the unknown, the unnameable, the infinite nescience, the darkness and mystery that shrouds man's whole life, lies everywhere, under his feet and among his hands. God's name too he has often since written; but a second time, as it is believed, he has not called upon men to love God. Whence this ominous silence? Love, in the human and only sense in which it has a meaning for us, is of persons and not of things. If God is the eternities, the immensities, the veracities, the unconscious, it would be most preposterous and absurd to ask us to love him. Wonder and prostration, self-annihilation—all these, if you will, command, but not love, which cannot live except in the light of one who loves and knows. Do the eternities love me? Do the immensities know me? Does the unconscious care for me? I know the difficulties, I see the obscurities when we attempt to think of God as a person. The idea of God can be expressed in human language analogically only; yet is it undeniably and forever true that the highest being who knows and loves is the absolute highest. Eternities and immensities belong to Him, not He to them. Whatever allowance we may be disposed to make in consideration of the fact that Mr. Carlyle is a rhapsodist and a seer, it is impossible not to recognize that in his thinking God is not a person, and is not therefore the God whom St. John declared to be Love. Mr. Carlyle has a disciple who is a most lucid and intelligible writer, whose thought is as transparent as the expression he gives it is precise; and he has translated his master's idea of God into the plainest and simplest language. "God," says Mr. Matthew Arnold, "is the eternal power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness." . . . "The stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being." And that this "eternal power," this "stream of tendency," is not a person who thinks

and loves, he plainly tells us. The God of Christianity and of Judaism is, he says, only a magnified and non-natural man.

Here we have no mystic phrase, no uncertain light, no poetic symbolism; but the clear revelation of the eternities and the immensities. The word God is still employed because no other has such poetic and mysterious power over the human mind; and this is but an example of a general process in which the meaning of words is undergoing a complete transformation. Mr. Carlyle's God then does not love. He is "a force and thousandfold complexity of forces; a force which is not *we*. That is all, it is not *we*; it is altogether different from *us*. Force, force, everywhere force." Strength is the divine attribute; the strong are God's children; and to be weak is not only miserable, but immoral. This ideal fills him with fierce thoughts and dark imaginings. The crashing of thrones, and the falling of altars, and the lurid light of burning cities, and the horrid din of murderous battle inspire him with wild delight. Force is building temples for its worship upon the wreck and ruin of all things. He loses more and more sympathy and tenderness, until he is wholly possessed by a sarcastic and gloomy indignation. The earth becomes a charnel-house, the dead uproar; the light of heaven dies out. They only are blessed who find rest in the bosom of the unconscious. The most fanatical hater of dogmas and creeds, he is become the most intolerant of thinkers. What he esteems a sham and chimera is so for the eternal laws. A symbol worn out for him, is henceforth useless forever for all men. In such a temper contradictions must abound. He makes silence a god, and is himself a man of infinite words. The French Revolution fills him with a terrible glee, and yet he curses democracy. The end of life he declares, with Goethe, to be action and not thought; and yet he keeps thinking and does not otherwise act. To reform a world, he well says, no wise man will undertake; and yet he chafes and is angry because the world has not been reformed by his preaching. If God is only the "stream of tendency," M. Renan is doubtless a true philosopher. "The thinker," he says, "believes that he has little right to direct the affairs of his planet; and, contented with the lot which has fallen to him, he accepts his impotence without regret. A spectator in the universe, he knows that the world belongs to him only as a subject of study; and though he were able to reform it, he would perhaps find it so curious as it is, that he would lack the courage to undertake the task."

Mr. Carlyle is not an original thinker. His theories are English interpretations of German thought; but interpretations which only a man of genius could have made. His influence and significance will be lightly estimated by those alone who have not



understood him. His is the most important name in the English literature of this century, and the power which he has exercised upon the religious thought of England, and even of America, is vast and profound. In his earlier writings, in spite of the latent pantheism which has grown upon him with such fatal effect, he appealed to the higher and spiritual nature of man with an eloquence which reaches the inmost soul. He is a truer poet than Byron or Mr. Tennyson; a profounder thinker than Stuart Mill or Mr. Herbert Spencer; and a worthier historian than Macaulay or Mr. Froude. He has the most real and subtle humor; the pathos of a "divine despair;" infinite indignation; the holiest anger, and a seraph's loathing of mere matter; and by nature he is not without tenderness and the deepest sympathy.

His misfortune and defect is profound and radical skepticism concerning the highest truth. Greater and more awful than the eternities, the immensities, the unconscious, he can conceive of nothing. The many-colored picture of life is painted on a canvas of darkness, and in the background there hovers a region of doubt which thought cannot possibly transform into certainty. He fails to perceive that what forces us to recognize a reality beneath appearances, proclaims also the presence of mind in the laws and harmonies of nature. The fearful and infinite force overwhelms him, and the supreme and central power of love and wisdom is not felt. Hence we find him still, as his disciple has sung of himself:

"Wandering between two worlds, one dead,  
The other powerless to be born."

After all that can be said, has been said, in praise of Force, this still remains to be said, that it cannot be loved. And yet except in trustful love man finds no peace and no blessedness.

"Unhappy men," said St. Teresa, "who do not love!"



## CEDMON: HIS GENIUS AND INFLUENCE.

1. *Cædmon's Paraphrase.* Ed. Ben. Thorpe.
2. *The Ruthwell Cross.* Ed. Prof. Geo. Stephens, F.S.A. : London, 1866.
3. *Cædmon, the First English Poet.* R. S. Watson : 1875.
4. *De Carminibus Anglo-Saxonicis Cadmoni.* E. G. Sandras.
5. *History of Whitby and Whitby Abbey.* Lionel Charlton : York, 1779.
6. *Bouterwek. De Cædmone. Elberfeldæ.*
7. *Cædmon's Fall of Man.* Translated by W. H. F. Bosanquet.
8. *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie.* 3 Bde.
9. *Ecclesiastical History of the Venerable Bede.*
10. *Early English Writers.* Henry Morley : Vols. i, ii. London.

**H**ENRY MORLEY is a painstaking writer. He does conscientious work. But his style is not attractive. It creeps. It is characteristic of the sober earnestness with which he labors. In his *Early English Writers* he undertakes to reveal all the treasures of English literature. It is a life-work, and he seems to have laid himself out to it with hearty good-will. He certainly brings together a great deal of miscellaneous matter. He even attempts to reconstruct the intellectual and material life of the period he deals with; but he is not successful. It is as though one were to cart together the rubbish of a ruin and tell us: "These are the materials of which such and such an ancient building is composed; handle them, admire them; it is a labor of love for me to bring them together." Taine goes farther. He takes the material and reconstructs a porch, or a room, or an outhouse, and tells us: "Such is the porch, such the room; judge for yourself of the rest of the building." But sometimes he takes the stable for the dwelling-house, or the dwelling-house for the stable, according as he is prepared to praise or blame. They both fail; but for different reasons. Taine has the mental grasp and the generalizing power; but he is intellectually color-blind. Morley is an honest but awkward worker; he cannot manage his materials. Then he lacks certain primary qualities necessary for the good critic. He has no genius for psychological analysis; he cannot sift facts; he has not learned how to read between lines. Take, for instance, his treatment of Cedmon. He recognizes his greatness, but he does not know how to take it out of the myths in which it is enveloped. He seems to have a vague idea of his influence, though he cannot trace it out. He even commits himself to that fanciful theory of Palgrave's concerning the origin of the name Cedmon. As a pretty piece of word-romancing we give the latter's conclusion in his own words, without allud-

ing to the manner in which Henry Morley weaves it into his story: "Now, to the name Cædmon, whether considered as a simple or as a compound, no plain and definite meaning can be assigned, if the interpretation be sought in the Anglo-Saxon language; whilst that very name *is* the initial word of the book of Genesis in the Chaldee paraphrase, or Targum of Onkelos: *b' Cadmin* or *b' Cadmon* (the *b'* is merely a prefix) being a literal translation of *b' Raschith* or 'In principio,' the initial word of the original Hebrew text. It is hardly necessary to observe that the books of the Bible are denominated by the Jews from their initial words: they quote and call Genesis by the name of *b' Raschith*; the Chaldaic Genesis would be quoted and called by the name of *b' Cadmin*, and this custom, adopted by them at least as early as the time of St. Jerome, has continued in use until the present day."<sup>1</sup> The word Cædmon is not found in the old English dictionaries; but the word *Ced* is, and means boat or wherry; so that Cedmon would mean boatman or wherryman. It is a name still common in Yorkshire. Writing in the last century, Lionel Charlton says: "Cedmon's memory remained in great veneration, not only at Streanshalh, but also through the whole kingdom of Northumberland, where his name was long honorably used as an appellative or proper name, and after the conquest was adopted as a surname; so that there yet remain to these our days some families in Whitby and its neighborhood that are known by the name of Cedmon or Sedman; a name with us the most honorable and ancient of all others."<sup>2</sup> Bouterwek, an authority of great weight on such subjects, finds no difficulty in deriving the name from an old English origin.<sup>3</sup> The writer would scarcely lay such stress upon the mere name were it not for some attempts to build up a theory, to which Mr. Henry Morley inclines, that the Culdees and their parent Irish Church received their teachings and traditions, not from Rome, but from the East. This is a theory for which the writer, after a diligent search, has been able to discover no foundation.

But to return to Mr. Morley's book. The history of literature is at present a popular subject. But the day is past when such a

<sup>1</sup> *Archæologia*, vol. xxiv. p. 342.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Whitby*, B. i. p. 17: York, 1779.

<sup>3</sup> In a learned dissertation on the subject he says: *Ipsum Cedmonis nomen* (cf. Gr. Gr. 2, 507) initio appellativum fuisse, dubium non est. Variæ ejus formæ sunt: Cedmon, Cædmon, Ceadmon, vox ipsa composita e *mon*, vir (cf. Paraphr. p. 89, 3: *flotmon nauta*, p. 186, 12; *vraec-mon*, fugitivus), et *ced*, quod ut in glossis a Cl. Monio editis est (p. 331) lintrem denotat. Cedmon tamen non nautam significare videtur, sed potius idem valere quod *scægdhmon*, pirata, a *scægdh*, *scægdh* liburna, scapha. cf. Gr. 3, 437, ibique Gl. Monii. Hoc vero nomen nihil infame habuisse, alia ejusmodi veterum nomina, e. g. *landsceatha* latro, *hros-diop*, *heriwolf*, *beowulf* cet. satis luculenter testanter. cf. Gr. Gr. 3, 785, notam.—*De Cedmone, Elberfelda*, p. 9.

history must be a string of crude notes concerning an author with a few specimen verses tagged on to the tail end. Literature is representative of something deeper than itself, and as such must be treated. It is the outcome of history. It is the expressed thought and sentiment of an age as well as of an individual. We expect to find how far it records the one and the other; and there is no excuse for not being able so to handle literature. One's impressions of a book are not an adequate criticism of the book. The Schlegels, and Sainte-Beuve, and Matthew Arnold do not so criticize; and they are good models in their method, if not in their treatment. Though of Matthew Arnold we must add, that we speak exclusively of his literary criticisms, for when he enters on the domain of religion he becomes silly. Henry Morley is the first historian of English literature who tries to do full justice to Cedmon, and endeavors to say all that can be said concerning him. It is a subject worthy of his learning; and, considering his slender stock of materials, his effort is as creditable to him as it is praiseworthy. It is the purpose of the writer to endeavor to unravel fact from legend in the life of this great poet, to dwell upon his poetry as the outcome of circumstances, and to trace his influence so far as he can find a perceptible clue to its action.

# I.

Let us forget the England of to-day and go back to the seventh century. Rest we on the sea-beaten cliffs of Whitby. It was then known as Streanshalh, and received its more modern name only from the Danes. The zealous and devoted Bishop Aidann is still actively at work. It was in 640, at Hartlepool, that he founded the first nunnery in Northumberland, and placed at its head an Irish lady, called Heru. Later on he builds a monastery at Whitby. He appoints to govern it the abbess Hilda. A most remarkable woman was this saint. Baptized at the age of fourteen by Paulinus, she preserved unspotted the robe of innocence, with which, on that day, she was clothed. She lived with her relatives and friends till the age of thirty-three, when she enters a convent in East Anglia and consecrates herself to God. Thence she is called by Aidann to govern the new-built monastery at Whitby. It is a double monastery, having a house for men and one for women, according to a custom prevalent in those days.<sup>1</sup> With both is Hilda charged, and well and efficiently does she govern them. The monastery of men becomes a shrine of learning and science, and is noted as the nursery whence issued several saintly bishops. The pru-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lingard's "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," for examples and authorities, pp. 82, 83; also Vit. St. Liobæ apud Mab, Sæc. 3.

dence, tact, and holy life of the abbess extend their beneficial influence far beyond the convent walls. Bishops and kings consult her under difficulties.<sup>1</sup> Contesting parties refer their feuds to her and abide by her decision. Her tact in this respect was noteworthy. No one ever thought of appealing from her word. She died in 680, in her sixty-third year, deplored by all, and left in the north of England a name undimmed by centuries. Her memory is still kept green by the gratitude of a people to whose ancestors she was a benefactor. Everything strange or wonderful in the neighborhood of Whitby occurs through her interposition. Nothing hurtful might approach her abode. Wild geese could not fly over her monastery.<sup>2</sup> Ammonites abound in that district; to the fancies of the people they are snakes turned to stone by the dear St. Hilda. Under favorable circumstances a mirage may be seen in one of the windows of the ruins of the church still standing; it is the dear St. Hilda, who continues to show her love for the good people of Whitby, by watching over them from this window.<sup>3</sup> Childish fancies these of a childlike people, who thus embody their gratitude and devotion in legend which outlives history and hard fact. But it is not for any or all of these things that the writer introduces St. Hilda; it is rather because she fostered the greatest poet of her age. She encouraged and drew out the genius that was to revolutionize the popular mind. She was the fast friend of Cedmon. And thus it is, that at the cradle of English Christian song, as at that of the Christian religion among the English, as at that of the same in Judea, as at that of humanity itself, sits a woman.

## II.

The life of Cedmon, like that of his great successor, Shakspeare, lies buried in fable and obscurity. But through the mists in which

---

<sup>1</sup> Butler, "Lives of the Saints," vol. iv. p. 370.

<sup>2</sup> Camden.

<sup>3</sup> A paper that was formerly printed and sold in Whitby alludes to these legends. It may be found in Grose's "Antiquities of England," vol. vi. p. 163. Therein St. Hilda is represented as speaking in the following rude verses, written with more affection than good taste:

"Likewise a window there I placed,  
That you might see me as undressed:  
In morning gown and night-vail there,  
All the day long fairly appear.  
At the west end of the church you'll see  
Nine paces there, in each degree;  
But if one foot you stir aside,  
My comely presence is denied;  
Now this is true what I have said,  
So unto death my due I've paid."

his name is enveloped, we can discern enough whereby to know that he was advanced in years before he became a monk; that prior thereto he was an eminently pious man; that he sought rather to obey the dictates of his conscience than to please men; that his genius was appreciated in his own day, and that he was regarded as one of the brightest glories of his age. The first glimpse we get of him is at festivals and entertainments. On such occasions, when the guests were well filled with meat and warmed up with beer, it was customary for each to contribute to the common amusement of all by singing a song. To this we find Cedmon uniformly objecting. When he saw the musical instrument approach, he arose from the table and went home. At first sight such conduct would mark him as being unsocial. Why might he not let the harp pass him by? Others there were who could not sing, and still who remained and enjoyed the occasion. The usual penalty for such delinquencies was to be compelled to take a certain quantity of beer in one drink. He might have paid the penalty or allowed himself to be mulcted in some other manner, and not have persistently marred the pleasures of the festival by leaving in so abrupt a manner. Reason there must have been, and reason there was, for the strange proceeding. Cedmon's was no sullen disposition. It is not, as the Venerable Bede informs us, because he could not, so much as because he would not, sing, that he left the festive hall so frequently. His companions knew that he could sing, and in all probability anticipated from him the crowning effort of the occasion. It was to avoid their displeasure and perhaps their anger by a direct refusal, that he chose to leave at some favorable moment prior to the placing of the harp in his hand. And what were those songs he did not choose to sing? They were not the pretty sentimentalities of modern drawing-rooms. Such things were unknown in Cedmon's day. They were not soundings of the deeper feeling of love. That too was unknown as a sentiment to be sung and played with. "That cultivated feeling," says Sharon Turner, "which we call love, in its intellectual tenderness and finer sympathies, was neither predominant nor probably known. The stern and active passions were the rules of society, and all the amusements were gross or severe."<sup>1</sup> They might have been martial lays; but to these Cedmon would scarcely have objected. He who sang so well of the warrings of the angels in heaven, and described so graphically the submersion of Pharaoh's hosts, could not find it in him to refuse to chant a strophe of the Fight of Finnesburgh or sing the deeds of Beowulf. He had sung them from boyhood; he had been fired by their spirit; he knew them by heart; they were

---

<sup>1</sup> "Anglo-Saxons," vol. iii. p. 263.

part of his thinking. Not to these did he have repugnance; but there was another species of song popular at festivals, which it grieved his soul to listen to. It was the mythic deeds of Thor and Odin, and the other pagan gods, that he refused to sing. "It might easily be proved," says Dr. Guest, "that our fathers had poems on almost all the subjects which were once thought peculiar to the Edda."<sup>1</sup> And there was still another kind of poetry, which was at first connected with the rites and ceremonies of the pagan religion, and which, long after these rites and ceremonies had fallen into disuse, continued to be sung at festivals and wakes. It was a practice common to many of the Teuton races. And the songs used were generally of a most unspeakable character.<sup>2</sup> Now, as late as the middle of the ninth century, Leo IV. forbade the Saxons to sing the diabolical hymns which the common people were accustomed to sing over their dead.<sup>3</sup> This was the singing that shocked Cedmon's Christian sensitiveness. It clouded the sunshine of his naturally convivial disposition. He felt that it was unworthy of a Christian's lips to utter, or a Christian's ear to listen to. It was made up of words bearing an idolatrous import, and possessed of a demoralizing influence. He saw that no good came of it. And once he was at an entertainment in the neighborhood of Whitby Abbey; the company was in a rejoicing mood; the beer flowed freely; the harp was taken up; one of the feasters began to sing; the song was of this objectionable kind. Cedmon could not endure it; he left the hall in sadness. With heavy heart he went out to the stable to take care of the horses. It was the custom for one of the company to guard the horses during the night; for at this time honesty was not one of the English virtues, and theft was considered a crime only when detected. In his solitude the heinousness of these pagan songs among a Christian people weighs him down. It is a thought that has been growing upon him. For some time past he has been asking himself if there is no way by which to banish this last remnant of paganism still clinging to the English mind. While revolving the subject in his heart he looks across the plain and discerns the lights from Streaneshalch stream in upon him. He remembers the Abbess Hilda; he thinks of the good monks who live under her mild and motherly protection; he is not unmindful of the calm and peaceful life they lead; he contrasts it with the rude scenes through which he has frequently to

<sup>1</sup> "English Rhythms," vol. ii. p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Thus of the Lombards did Gregory the Great write: *More suo immolaverunt caput capræ diabolo, hoc ei per circuitum currentes, et carmine nefando dedicantes.*—*Greg. M. Dialog.* iii. cap. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Carmina diabolica* putæ nocturnis horis super mortuos vulgus facere solet. See Wackernagel, "Das Wessebrunner Gebet," p. 25.



pass. He remembers the boisterous feast-making from which he came, and then he thinks that just at that very moment those good monks and nuns are also rejoicing, but after another fashion. They too express their sentiments in canticles of gladness and sorrow as varied as the emotions of human nature. "There," he said to himself, "is heaven upon earth; there are men and women leading angels' lives, and like those around the throne of God, singing the praises of their Creator." Thereupon he muses upon heaven; he remembers the angelic choirs; he feels his soul within him flutter with eager desire to sing of the abode of the blessed, of the creation of the world, of the ways of Providence towards men; and then and there he determines to render himself worthy of the honor of singing of these high themes by purifying his heart still more, and making it a fitting instrument to be played upon by the Divine Hand. He resolves to consecrate the remainder of his days to the noble purpose of making poems that will supersede the shameful songs that still bind so many Christian hearts to the pagan world of thought. Then and there does he feel the new mantle of inspiration descend upon him; he sings the creation; he dreams of it; he remembers the next morning the lines he had composed the night previous; he also remembers his good resolution. He goes to the Abbess Hilda and tells her of his purpose. He repeats to her the introductory lines he improvised on the Creator and His works. She calls together several of the learned men in her monastery and has Cedmon to repeat his verses before them; for she is first desirous of knowing whether the verses he repeats are his own, or whether or no he is an impostor. But they all of them are favorably impressed with his rare talents. "They concluded," says Bede, "that heavenly grace had been conferred on him by our Lord." Still they resolve to put him to a further test. So they recite for him some passages from the Holy Scriptures; these they explain to him, and request him to compose some verses on them. He goes home, constructs his poem, and returns next morning with the whole idea done up in most excellent poetry. St. Hilda is delighted. Embracing the grace of God in the man, she encouraged him to adopt the monastic habit.<sup>1</sup> He did so, and she associated him with the brethren in her monastery, leaving instructions that he be taught sacred history. And as he learned its meaning and spirit, he turned various parts of the sacred Scripture into English poetry.

The English language had never before clothed such sublime thoughts. Never was its power of expression stretched to its full

---

<sup>1</sup> Unde mox abbatissa amplexata gratiam Dei in viro, sæcularem illum habitum relinquare, et monachicum suscipere propositum docuit. "Hist. Eccl.," Lib. iv. cap. 24.

bent. None but the greatest genius could render it adequate to the themes. But Cedmon was equal to the task. He succeeded admirably. His poems became popular. "The revolution," says Guest, "effected by Cedmon appears to be complete."<sup>1</sup> All imitation of his works only showed how inimitable they were. "Others after him," says Bede, "attempted, in the English nation, to compose religious poems, but none could ever compare with him."<sup>2</sup> He created that intense and earnest religious feeling in the popular mind which was so prevalent down to the days of the Venerable Bede.<sup>3</sup> The pagan hymns became less frequent. The strong light of his bright song dimmed their last rays. Expressions so forcible and verses so harmonious laid strong hold upon the popular thinking. The man singing so beautifully must have been inspired by Heaven. So thought the people. And some among them had a dim recollection of a great poet who had been first a shepherd, and having learned how to sing in a dream, remembered what he had composed in his sleep, sang it next day and continued to sing beautiful things till death. It mattered little to them about the name; but among them was a poet who must have learned after some such manner. Perhaps an angel taught him. So it was believed in the days of the Venerable Bede. But let us recall the earlier myth. It is related of Hallbiörn that he was a shepherd lad who watched his flock near by the grave of the poet Thorleifr. One day he took it in his head to sing a hymn of praise in honor of the poet; "but," we are told, "because the lad was entirely uneducated, he was unable to carry out his pious design. Then, one night did the hillock open up, and a stately man walked up to the shepherd, touched his tongue, repeated a verse aloud for him, and returned to his grave. When Hallbiörn awoke he remembered the verse which he had heard, and from that day forth became a celebrated poet."<sup>4</sup> Thus it was that Cedmon had come to be regarded as a divinely inspired shepherd.

Once more we catch a glimpse of the man. He himself lifts the veil for us. He is at the pinnacle of his fame; old age is closing

<sup>1</sup> Rhythms, II. p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> Wright, Essay on Anglo-Saxon Literature, in *Biographia Britannica Literaria*, vol. i.

<sup>4</sup> Bouterwek, *Cædmon's Dichtungen*, Vorrede. Cf. Thorleifr Saga Cp. vii. Script. Hist. Island, iii. 106. Grimm. Myth. 855. Prof. Stephens erroneously places this legend in the tenth or beginning of the eleventh century. Bouterwek says: "Vorliebe für das Scandinavische Heidenthum könnte in Cædmons Wunderberuf zum Dichter eine Erinnerung an einen ins Christenthum herübergenommenen heidnischen Mythos erblicken." Pausanias relates a similar tradition of Æschylus: "Æschylus says of himself that when a boy he once fell asleep in a field, where he was watching some grapes, and that Bacchus appeared to him in a dream and exhorted him to write tragedies." Lib. i. cap. xxi. 2, p. 28, ed. Dindorfii. Pausanias lived about A. D. 170.

upon him with an iron grasp ; friends are dropping away from him into the grave ; the old faces have passed ; the new ones may have more admiration for his genius, but he cannot make them bosom friends. A large stone cross is to be erected. It is a costly monument, a great artistic effort for that day. Our Lord is represented as standing on two swine. A Latin inscription tells us that He is a judge of equity, and that the wild beasts acknowledge the Saviour of the world in the desert.<sup>1</sup> Lower still Paul and Anthony are pictured breaking their loaf in the desert ; another Latin inscription speaks the fact. But as in olden times similar stone monuments had the praises of some heathen god inscribed in Runic characters, so is it now desired to have a Christian hymn perpetuated upon this. Who is so capable as Cedmon ? Time and again, as he himself tells us, has he composed such inscriptions. And in this, his last, he seems to have thrown his whole soul. He has a dream, in which the Rood speaks to him and recounts its feelings and emotions as the Redeemer was transfixed to it :

“Methought I saw a Tree in mid-air hang—  
Of trees the brightest—mantling o’er with light-streaks ;  
A beacon stood it, glittering with gold.”<sup>2</sup>

Long lay he, looking with sorrow upon the Healer’s Tree—  
*Hælendes treow*—till at last it spake and told how it grew upon the  
wood’s edge, was cut down and set upon a hill. It says :

“I spied the Frey<sup>3</sup> of man with eager haste  
Approach to mount me ; neither bend nor break  
I durst, for so it was decreed above,  
Though earth about me shook.”

And then the Rood tells the whole story of the suffering and death and burial and resurrection of the Saviour. It further speaks of its becoming honored since that memorable event, though once it was reckoned “hardest punishment, loathliest among men, ere life’s way it had made straight and broad to speech-bearing mortals.” For which it considers itself honored more than all other trees, even as

“His Mother, Mary’s self, Almighty God,  
Most worthily hath raised above all women.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Jesus Christus iudex aequitatis. Bestiæ et dracones cognoverunt in deserto salvatorem mundi.

<sup>2</sup> Thuhte me thæt ic gesawe syllicre treow  
On lyfte lædan, leóht bewunden,  
Beama beohrtost. Eall thæt beacen waes  
Begoten mid golde.

<sup>3</sup> Frey is the God of peace. When its mythological significance was lost, it became an epithet of honor for princes, and is found frequently applied to our Lord and God the Father. Notice that Cedmon gives the expression to the Rood, but nowhere in the poem uses it himself.

And now the poet enters into himself and expresses his great confidence in obtaining salvation through the Cross. This confidence is all the greater inasmuch as he hath sung its glories so frequently.

“Soul-longings many in my day I’ve had,  
My life’s hope now is that the Tree of Triumph  
Must seek I. Than all others oftener  
Did I alone extol its glories;  
Thereto my will is bent, and when I need  
A claim for shelter, to the Rood I’ll go.  
Of mightiest friends, from me are many now  
Unclasped, and far away from our world’s joys;  
They sought the Lord of Hosts, and now in Heaven,  
With the High-Father, live in glee and glory;  
And for the day most longingly I wait,  
When the Saviour’s Rood that here I contemplate,  
From this frail life shall take me into bliss—  
The bliss of Heaven’s wards: the Lord’s folk there  
Is seated at the feast; there’s joy unending;  
And He shall set me there in glory,  
And with the saints their pleasures I shall share.”<sup>1</sup>

The poem breathes throughout charity, sweetness, piety. It is a dream, an allegory, the forerunner of the numerous dreams that subsequently figure in English literature: of Langland’s and Chaucer’s and Lydgate’s and Dunbar’s and Lindsay’s and John Bunyan’s. But this wail of Cedmon’s for the friends of other days, with which the poem closes; this longing hope soon to join them; this living by anticipation in the celestial mansions, is the last glimpse we get of the man till the hour when his desires are to be fulfilled and his poetic soul passes from the beauties of earth to the bliss of heaven.

Living in so elevated a sphere of thought, Cedmon could find it in himself to write nothing but what tended to elevate and spiritualize the aspirations and emotions of human nature. The Venerable Bede bears testimony to this effect: “He never could compose frivolous and useless poems, but those alone pertaining to religion became his religious tongue.”<sup>2</sup> But withal, wide was the range of his themes. He did not confine himself to the mere paraphrasing of Scripture, or allegorizing upon the Rood. He also sang of the Divine attributes; of the judgments and the mercy of God to men; of the beauty of virtue and the hideousness of vice; but he sang with such fervor and persuasion that he led many from

<sup>1</sup> The Ruthwell cross. That Cedmon wrote this poem is stated on the stone: *Cedmon mæ fauatho*.

<sup>2</sup> Nihil unquam frivoli et supervacui poematis facere potuit; sed ea tantummodo quæ ad religionem pertinent, religiosam ejus linguam decebant. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. xxiv.

their evil ways to the practice of good deeds. This is no fictional assertion. The historian takes the pains to inform us of it. "By his verses," says the Venerable Bede, "many were often excited to despise the world, and to aspire to heaven." What unction there must have been in them, thus to stir up the normally obtuse feelings of his English brethren! And with what loving admiration those verses must have been read and recited. "A new poem by Cedmon!" — with joy did these words ring in the ears of the people; eagerly did they flock around the good monk who brought them the tidings and came to read the poem for them. Soon their singers and harpers knew it by heart and went about reciting it. Warmly were they received and well were they repaid for their services. No doubt some jealous ones there were among them, who still clung to the old pagan songs, and who attempted to belittle the productions of the heaven-inspired bard. But they daily lost ground with the people and soon found that in order to make a living they must know the poems of Cedmon. Parents taught them to their children, and in every household in Northumbria were they sung. And as they became part of the people's thinking the recollections of paganism faded out into the dim mists of the past, occasionally to be remembered in order to weave a legend about some Christian great one, such as that they applied to Cedmon himself. Only Shakspeare, King James's version of the Bible, and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, ever took such hold on the popular English mind as did Cedmon's poems.

The secret of his success was twofold. It lay in his great genius and in his holy life. Of the first it is not easy, at this distance of time, to form an adequate idea. Conceive a people with the ignorance and mental inaction of centuries weighing them down and making them of the earth, earthy; knowing only the use of the instruments of war and the chase; brutal in their habits; material in their thoughts; their uncouth natures slightly glossed with a varnish of Christianity; Christian indeed in name and in creed, but pagan in many of their customs and manners;—conceive all this, and then remember that this people is daily witnessing scenes of war and bloodshed. The old English chroniclers record them with an admirable coolness. "A. 658. This year Kenwalh fought against the Welsh at Peonna. . . . A. 661. This year, during Easter, Kenwalh fought at Pontesbury, and Wulfhere, the son of Penda, laid the country waste as far as Ashdown. . . . And Wulfhere, the son of Penda, laid waste Wight, and gave the people of Wight to Ethelwalde, king of the South Saxons, because Wulfhere had been his sponsor at baptism. . . . A. 675. This year, Wulfhere, the son of Penda, and Escwin, the son of Cenfus, fought at Beaden-head. . . . A. 676. And Ethelred, king of the Mer-

cians, laid waste Kent. . . . A. 679. This year, Elfwin was slain near the Trent, where Egfrid and Ethelred fought, and St. Etheldrida died." The death of a saint, a battle, the slaying of a man, are all told in the same breath; they are all of them events of almost daily occurrence. These are the scenes in which Cedmon lived and moved. In the midst of all this din, he raised his voice and was heard. He sang the substance of which all the ancient myths were but the shadow. He led men to forget more and more the pagan past; to exchange the dirges on the death of Baldr for the doleful strains on the Saviour's passion; to let the glories of Valhalla become dimmed by the more spiritual and real splendors of the heavenly kingdom. This was a great work; it was a noble task; it was moulding the popular mind into new shape; it was helping to spiritualize their natures; it was preparing the soil for the seeds of grace. None but the greatest genius could have achieved it all. He brought the Oriental imagery of the Bible within the comprehension of the humblest English mind; he draped it in the English fashion of thinking; he made its purely spiritual language palpable to the English imagination. He did it in language musical and flowing. His verses have been the admiration of all those who gave them attention. "His accent," says Guest, "always falls in the right place, and the emphatic syllable is ever supported by a strong one. His rhythm changes with the thought—now marching slowly with a stately theme, and now running off with all the joyousness of triumph, when his subject teems with gladness and exultation."

But the holiness of his life no less than the strength of his genius added weight to his words, and made them strike with such force. The Venerable Bede bears testimony to his virtues. He was an eminently religious man, fond of prayer, devoted to the reception of the sacraments of the Church, attentive and punctual in the performance of his various duties. He was a cheerful worker in God's service, submissive in all things to the will of his superiors, happy when he saw others the same; but he was the terror of those whom he found disorderly and lagging in their duties towards their Creator. Having entered religion late in life, he was prepared to appreciate its quiet, peaceful, undisturbed ways, as he contrasted them with the fickleness and boisterousness of the world he had abandoned, and he thought that others should in this respect feel as he felt. His happy, cheerful disposition—always prepared with a kind word or a pleasant saying—tended to make the religious life attractive to others. There was nothing gloomy in his piety. He was no friend of moroseness. This last he re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rhythms, II. p. 50.

garded in its true light, rather as a hindrance than a help to genuine religious feeling. Leading such a life, how else could his death be than happy also? And such the Venerable Bede tells us it was. Let us linger over his last days, and watch the going out of that brilliant meteor of English song. To be able to stand by the death-bed of England's first great poet is a rare privilege. For some time a disease, the nature of which is not mentioned, had been undermining his constitution; during two weeks he felt it weakening him beyond recovery; and now he feels that the day of his dissolution is at hand. Nothing daunted, he moves about among his brethren; his cheery soul sheds sunshine into their hearts; in whatever mood he finds them, he leaves them with a laughing face and a pleasant thought. The evening of this last day he walks over to the infirmary, and asks those in attendance to prepare a bed for him, which they do with no small share of surprise. He stays up till after midnight, keeping everybody enlivened with his pleasant conversation. Midnight passed, he asked to communicate in the reception of the holy Eucharist. And they answered: "What need of the Eucharist? for you are not likely to die, since you talk so merrily with us, as if you were in perfect health." But he insisted on receiving it, and according to the custom of that day it was placed in his hands. He then asked those around him whether they were all in charity with him and free from rancor. There was only one answer—a unanimous "Yes." How else could they be with such a genial companion, holy religious, and great poet? He was full of life and humor; he had frequently made them laugh, but it was not at the expense of charity, it was not by giving pain to others. So, when the same question was put to him immediately after, well might he say: "I am in charity, my children, with all the servants of God." But the ruling passion asserted itself even in death. Cedmon desires to hear once more the praises of God sung, before he goes to sing them in heaven in union with the angelic choirs and the friends who passed before him. He would have his soul wafted upon the song of prayer and benediction ascending from the chapel near by. So he asks how soon the time was when the brothers were to sing the nocturnal praises of the Lord; and when told that it was not far off, he said: "Let us await that hour;" and signing himself with the sign of the cross, he laid his head on the pillow, and falling into a slumber, his soul passed away.<sup>1</sup> A death befitting his life.

Let us now address ourselves to that which still lives of him,—his spirit as embodied in his poetry.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bede, loc. cit.

III.

Cedmon's genius, in its first flight, disdains all midway courses, and soars into the celestial empyrean. With the deeds of human heroes he is familiar; but he will none of them. In praise of his holy Creator alone—Heaven's Ward—will he attune his harp. The gods of his English ancestors have been extolled; right proper is it then that the true God—the Glory-King of hosts—have a lay dedicated to him. And so the poet bursts forth into a most eloquent prelude; every word is brimful of meaning; every line bends beneath the weight of his theme, and word and line show each alike how he labored to grapple with his subject in a manner adequate to its dignity.

“Mickle right it is that we, heaven's guard,  
Glory-King of hosts! with words should praise,  
With hearts should love. He is of powers the efficacy;  
Head of all high creations;  
Lord Almighty! In him beginning never  
Or origin hath been; but he is aye supreme  
Over heaven-thrones, with high majesty  
Righteous and mighty.”<sup>1</sup>

Never, in the history of old English thought, was such a poetic beginning heard. It is the song of a soul strong in its convictions of the greatness and majesty of Him it extols. This is the passage said to have been composed by the poet that memorable night he watched in the stable. Then follows a brief account of the rebellion and fall of the angels, which, in all probability, was the theme given him by the learned men of the community as a test; for he afterwards reverts at length to the same subject. The description is vividly English. God is a stern Overlord who treats his adversaries with an iron hand. “Stern of mood he was; he gript them in his wrath; with hostile hands he gript them, and crushed them in his grasp.” This was succeeded by peace. On earth, it was a rare thing in his day; so he lives to sing of it in heaven.

“Then as before was peace in heaven—  
Fair peaceful ways; the Lord beloved of all—  
The ruler of His Thanes—in splendor grew;  
The good all bliss full-sharing with their Lord.”<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Tha waes sóth swa ær, sibb on heofnum—  
faegre freotho-theawas; frea eallum leof—  
theoden his thegnum—thrymmas weoxon;  
dugutha mid drihtne dreàm-hæbbendra.

—*Thorpe's Cedmon*, p. 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> Guest's Translation in “English Rhythms,” vol. ii.



As the subject grows upon the poet in all its greatness, he also rises with it. Could we be witnesses of the labor with which, as he pondered over verse after verse of the Bible, he struck out those flashes of light that shone in his day, and are not yet undimmed, we would see a giantlike struggle between matter and spirit; the limited utterance and the unbounded desire; the strong determination breaking up the new field of poesy with fierce energy. He read the sublime opening of Genesis. The awful sublimity of those words penetrated him: "And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of God moved over the waters."<sup>1</sup> Some expressions in it reminded him of his old English cosmogony. "The earth was void and empty." "This," thought he, "is the Ginunga-gap, the yawning abyss, of which my ancestors sang. I must sing of it too without introducing the flesh and bones of Ymir." Therefore he sang:

"Here yet did naught exist save cavern shade,  
But deep and dim did stand this wide abyss."<sup>2</sup>

And in these lines, if the poet remembered, he also anticipated. The "wide abyss"—*wīda grund*—is the Ginunga-gap—the yawning abyss—of the Edda; but so also is the "cavern shade"—*heolster-sceado*—the "darkness visible" of Milton.<sup>3</sup> Again the coloring of the older poems of his English ancestors clings to his description of things in that beginning of times. He remembers how it was sung: "When Ymir lived no earth was found, nor heaven above; one chaos all, *and nowhere grass*."<sup>4</sup> These were not the words, but they were clearly the idea in his mind when he dictated or penned these lines:

"Earth's surface was  
With grass not yet begreened; while far and wide,  
The dusky ways, with black, unending night,  
Did ocean cover."<sup>5</sup>

Thus he worked and thought in the smithy of his brain, as he hammered out his golden verses. Thus he brought the Scripture-thoughts within the grasp of the popular mind. But as he advances he leaves behind him still more the imagery of the past, and accommodates himself more closely to the new order of ideas. Even his metre changes to suit his mood. Thus, when discours-

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, chap. i. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ne waes hēr thā giet nymthe heolster-sceado  
wiht geworden, ac thes wīda grund stōð deōp and dim.—Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Job. x. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Edda.

<sup>5</sup> Folde waes thā gyt  
*græs ungrēne*: gārsecg theahte  
sweart synnihte side and wide,  
thonne waegās.—ll. 122-5.

ing on heaven and on the prerogatives of Satan, the line lengthens out into most solemn expression :

“ So fair was he made—so beauteous his form—  
Received from the Lord of hosts—he was bright  
As are the bright stars. His task was to praise  
The works of his Lord ; his heavenly joys  
To cherish most dear ; their Giver to thank  
For beauty and light upon him bestowed.”

Long might Satan have enjoyed his glory in heaven. But he began to plot. The poet read of it in Isaiah : “ How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning ? how art thou fallen to the earth, that didst wound the nations ? And thou saidst in thy heart : I will ascend into heaven ; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God ; I will sit in the mountain of the covenant, in the sides of the north ; I will ascend above the height of the clouds ; I will be like the Most High.”<sup>1</sup> Upon this passage he builds up a long argument of plotting on the part of Lucifer.

“ ‘ Wherefore,’ he said, ‘ shall I toil ?  
No need have I of master. I can work  
With my own hands great marvels, and have power  
To build a throne more worthy of a God,  
Higher in heaven. Why shall I, for His smile,  
Serve Him, bend to Him thus in vassalage ?  
I may be God as He.  
Stand by me, strong supporters, firm in strife.  
Hard-mooded heroes, famous warriors,  
Have chosen me for chief ; one may take thought  
With such for counsel, and with such secure  
Large following. My friends in earnest they,  
Faithful in all the shaping of their minds ;  
I am the master, and may rule this realm.’ ”<sup>2</sup>

Such rebellious language is severely punished. Satan and his adherents are cast into the infernal regions. These the poet also describes at length. Here again he combines the Scripture account of hell with the ancient English idea of it. To his ancestors fire had no terrors ; it was rather the cold, dreary, inactive life that made hell unendurable to them. Therefore, Cedmon combines the two ideas :

“ Each fiend through long and dreary evening,  
Hath fire renewed about him ; cometh then,  
Ere dawn, an eastern wind, fierce cold upon it—  
The dart of fire or frost must rankle there—  
Same hard affliction each must ever have.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah xiv. 12, 13, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Morley's version in “ A First Sketch of English Literature,” p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Thaer hæbbath heo on éfyn ungemet lange  
ealra feonda gehwilec, fyr éðneowe :  
thonne cymth on uhtan easterne wind,  
forst fyrnum cald symble fyr oðthe gār  
sum heard geswinc habban sceoldon.*

In this abode of suffering Satan addresses his companions in misery. He bemoans his plight. He surveys the torments by which he is surrounded. But the most unendurable of all is the thought that Adam is to take his place in heaven. Here the poet has some truly sublime touches. He combines, in a rare degree of excellence, dramatic action with descriptive power. The abrupt manner, and the sudden turn of expression, couched in the strongest language possible, speak of an enraged soul. We miss fiendish acuteness, but we find in its stead pride and churlishness enough.

“And Satan spake—he who in hell should rule—  
 Govern th’ abyss henceforth—in sorrow spake.  
 God’s angel erst, in heaven white he shone,  
 Till urged his mind, and most of all his pride,  
 To do no honor to the Lord’s sweet word.  
 Within him boiled his thoughts about his heart ;  
 Without, the wrathful fire pressed hot upon him—  
 He said : ‘ This narrow place is most unlike  
 That other we once knew in heaven high,  
 And which my Lord gave me ; though own it now  
 We must not, but to Him must cede our realm.  
 Yet right He hath not done to strike us down  
 To hell’s abyss—of heaven’s realm bereft—  
 Which with mankind to people He hath planned.  
 Pain sorest this, that Adam, wrought of earth,  
 On my strong throne shall sit, enjoying bliss,  
 Whilst we endure these pangs—hell-torments dire—  
 Woe ! woe is me ! could I but use my hands  
 And might I be from here one little hour—  
 One winter’s hour—then with this host would I—  
 —But press me hard these iron bands—this coil  
 Of chain—and powerless I am, so fast  
 I’m bound. Above is fire ; below is fire ;  
 A loathier landscape never have I seen ;  
 Nor smoulders aye the fire, but hot throughout.  
 In chains ; my pathway barred ; my feet tied down ;  
 Those hell-doors bolted all ; I may not move  
 From out these limb-bands ; binds me iron hard—  
 Hot-forged great grindles ! God has griped me tight  
 About the neck.’ ”

And so Satan continues addressing his associates, asking them to stand by him and not fail in the strife—“heroes stern of mood—renowned warriors—they have chosen me for chief.” The whole passage reminds one of the sublimest strains in *Paradise Lost*. There is less reasoning in Cedmon ; he is more objective ; the sufferings of his Satan are all physical, except the one pang of envy he feels at the thought that man is to be installed in his place. Milton is more subjective ; his Satan despises the mere physical pain ; it is the agony of mind incident upon humiliation and defeat that weighs upon him. Cedmon tells us of his hero’s pride ; we

feel the pride of Milton's Satan. This difference is due to their respective ages rather than to their geniuses. In Cedmon's day men did not analyze feelings and emotions; they acted and suffered and endured and spoke out the results of their thinking rather than its processes. When Milton wrote, thought was more developed; men were more reflective and analyzing, and it was natural for them to enter into the springs and motives of action.

But man must be made to share these hell-torments. So forthwith Satan undertakes to tempt him. He arrives in the garden of Paradise. There are the trees of good and evil. "The fruit was not alike. . . . The one was so pleasant, so fair and beautiful, so soft and delicate." He might have life eternal who ate of that. "There was the other, utterly black; that was death's tree, which much of bitter bare." There was no mistaking them. Satan pretends to be a messenger from God. Adam receives him with suspicion; tells him he understands God's commands, but nought of what he says. Satan pretends displeasure, threatens his Master's vengeance for the insult offered. Thereupon Adam asks him for some pledge or token by which he may know him to be sincere; but Satan has none, and forthwith, like a good keeper of his Overlord's place, Adam bids him begone: "Therefore I cannot thee obey, but thou mayst take thee hence." But Satan, nothing daunted, "turned him, wroth of mood, to where he saw the woman, on earth's realm, Eve standing, beautifully formed." With her he is successful in his evil design; for the poet takes care to assure us, "to her a weaker mind had the Creator assigned."<sup>1</sup> But Cedmon treats mother Eve with great tenderness. He seeks to palliate the evil she brought upon herself and the whole human race: "Yet did she it through faithful mind; she knew not that hence so many ills, sinful woes, must follow to mankind." However, the deed is consummated, and now it is Satan's turn to rejoice: "Then laughed and played the bitter-purposed messenger." Such is the story of the Fall, as sung by Cedmon. He sings it as he might have sung any domestic episode. We would not take it as the measure of his power. But later on, when he describes the flight of the Israelites and the destruction of Pharaoh, he is at home. Then the whole strength of his genius breaks out. The old Berserkr blood rises in him. He is no longer the historian, nor is he the translator. He is the true poet, the seer. The vision is before him in all its dread reality. The old spirit that used to fire the company with such themes as the Battle of Finnesburgh, inspires him to rival that soul-stirring poem. We will not attempt a met-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hæfde hire wacran hige  
Metod gemearcod.—*Cedmon*, Thorpe's ed. p. 37.

rical version. We prefer transcribing a literal rendering; it will thus retain more of the original fire. See, for instance, with what an apparent relish he paints preparations for battle: "They prepared their arms; the war advanced; bucklers glittered, trumpets blared, standards rattled; they trod the nation's frontier; around them screamed the fowls of war; the raven sang greedy of battle—dewy-feathered. Over the bodies of the host—dark choosers of the slain—the wolves sang their horrid even song." This is the language of one who has vividly before him what he pictures to the mind's eye. And now, take the destruction of Pharaoh and his host. It is a torrent of words, and re-echoes the thunders of Niagara:

"The folk were affrighted, the flood-dread seized on their sad souls; ocean wailed with death; the mountain heights were with blood besteam'd, the sea foamed gore; crying was in the waves, the water full of weapons; a death-mist rose; the Egyptians were turned back; trembling they fled, they felt fear; gladly would that host find their homes; their vaunt grew sadder: against them, as a cloud, rose the fell rolling of the waves; there came not any of that host to home, but from behind inclosed them fate with the wave. Where ways ere lay sea now raged. Their might was merged, the streams stood, the storm rose high to heaven, the loudest army-cry the hostile uttered; the air above was thickened with dying voices; blood pervaded the flood, the shield-walls were riven; shook the firmament that greatest of sea-deaths. . . . The bursting ocean whooped a bloody storm the seaman's way; till that the true God through Moses' hand enlarged its force, widely drove it, it swept death in its embrace. . . . Ocean raged, drew itself up on high; the storms rose, the corpses rolled. . . . The Guardian of the flood struck the unsheltering wave of the foamy gulfs with an ancient falchion, that in the swoon of death these armies slept."<sup>1</sup>

Here is destruction with a vengeance. It was with full zest the poet undertook to recount it. "The bursting ocean whooped a bloody storm . . . the storms rose, the corpses rolled." Were we not told it all was the work of the true God, we might well imagine we had found another relic of the vikings in their fierce pagan days. With this sublime outburst we cease quoting from *Cædmon*. It is in such passages, in which we pass behind the poem and its scriptural basis, that we are enabled to measure the strength of the poet's genius. He not only speaks the old language; he also thinks in the old routine of thinking, with his thoughts somewhat purified; but there is no ideal above that of personal bravery or brute force; anything higher was yet beyond the grasp of the old English mind; the spiritual element is there, but it is still a foreign element. He never rises above the sublimities of the Bible; he frequently lowers them to bring them within the compass of the popular thinking. His heaven is no longer the Walhalla of the Teutonic North. It becomes a costly, well-ordered church: "There the gate is golden, fretted with gems, with joys encircled for those who into the light of glory—to God's kingdom—may go; and,

<sup>1</sup> *Cædmon*, xlvii. p. 206.

round the walls appear beauteous angel-spirits and blessed souls—those who from hence depart; where martyrs give delight to the Creator and praise the Supreme Father—the King in his city—with holy voices.” Had he spoken otherwise he would have been ill-understood; his genius would have failed of reaching the general intelligence. He would not have fulfilled his mission.

## IV.

Such, then, is the poetry Cedmon sang. To us it sounds rude and abrupt. But in order to its appreciation we must set aside our modern standards of criticism and our polished phrasings, and go back to the rude age of the poet. Men's thoughts still ran in the old pagan groove. They were few and limited. What Stendhall says of the man of the tenth, applies more aptly to him of the seventh century,—that he desired only two things, viz., not to be killed, and to have a good leather coat. The people went to mass and listened to the instructions; but the routine of their daily life ran in the same groove with that of their pagan ancestors. They clung to the old superstitions. A pagan thread runs through English thought even to the present day, but it has lost its significance. The names of the days of the week, those of Yule-tide and Easter, are all so many relics of the old creed. So also is the May-pole. Unconsciously it is a perpetuation of the rites originally performed in honor of Phol.<sup>1</sup> The still familiar term Old Nick comes to us from the water-spirit Nicor. “It is not going too far,” says Kemble, “to assert that the boar's head, which yet forms the ornament of our festive tables, especially at Christmas, may have been inherited from heathen days; and that the vows made upon it in the Middle Ages may have had their sanction in ancient paganism.”<sup>2</sup> Nearly all the charms and spells that abound in the English provincial districts are remnants of the old superstitions, with the names of God and His saints substituted for those of the pagan divinities. Such was the case with a widespread charm for a sprained limb. The conjury ran thus, whilst a black woollen thread, with nine knots, was wound round the injured limb.

The Lord rade,  
And the foal slade;  
He lighted  
And he righted;  
Set joint to joint,  
Bone to bone,  
And sinew to sinew;  
Heal in the Holy Ghost's name.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “In England richtet man allgemein am ersten Mai einen sogenannten *maypole* auf wobei zwar an *pole*, *pfal*, *palus* ags. *pol* gedacht werden kann; doch dürften Pol, Phol anschlagen.”—*Grimm, Myth.* p. 581.

<sup>2</sup> *Anglo-Saxons*, vol. i. p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> Chalmers's *Nursery Tales*.

This charm, with slight changes, is to be found in Holland and Belgium as well. In 1842 the original pagan form was discovered "on the spare leaf of a MS.," at Merseberg. It reads as follows:

Phol endi Wódan	Phol and Wodan
Vuorum zi holza,	Went to the wood,
Da wart demo Balderes volon	Then of Balder's colt
Sin vuoz birenkit;	The foot was wrenched;
Thu biguolen Sinthgunt	Then Sinthgunt charmed him
Sunná era suister;	And her sister Sunna;
Thu biguolen Frua,	Then Frua charmed him
Volla era suister;	And her sister Folla;
Thu biguolen Wódan	Then Wodan charmed him
Só he wola conda:	As he well could do:
<i>Sósé bēnrínki, sósé blutrenki,</i>	<i>Both wrench of bone and wrench of blood,</i>
<i>Sósé lidrenki;</i>	<i>And wrench of limb;</i>
<i>Bēn zi bēna,</i>	<i>Bone to bone,</i>
<i>Bluot zi bluoda,</i>	<i>Blood to blood,</i>
<i>lid zi geliden,</i>	<i>limb to limb,</i>
<i>Sōse gelimida sin.<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>As if they were glued together.</i>

Such was the charm used in the old continental homestead by common ancestors both of English and Flemish. Its discovery was hailed with enthusiasm by antiquary and mythmonger—not so much for the sake of the subject-matter, nor for mere linguistic purposes, as that it contained the fullest list extant of the old English pagan divinities.<sup>2</sup> And if that list has come to be so scant—if in the whole range of old English literature so few definite allusions are to be found—if in the days of the Venerable Bede much of the pagan mythology has dropped out of men's thinking and many of the consequent practices have been abandoned, it is due in a great degree to the popularity of Cedmon's songs and Scripture paraphrasings. And another there was who shares the glory with him, but to whom we can only give a passing mention. He was a youth just merging into manhood when Cedmon was passing away from this life. He may have seen the poet of Whitby. He must have been an admirer of his verses. He must have heard of the wonders wrought through their influence, and his poet-soul must have yearned to do a similar work amongst the West Saxons. That other was Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury. He also notices how hard it is to penetrate the crust of habit that has grown over the naturally slow-moving intelligence of the people. His heart beats in sympathy with them; he yearns to see them elevated into a more refined and a more spiritual atmosphere. A learned man, versed in Latin, Greek and Hebrew—and in this respect he differs from Cedmon—he forgets his learning and brings himself down to the level of those children in intelligence. Standing on a bridge,

<sup>1</sup> Kemble, Saxons in England, vol. i. p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

he sings to them, in the mother tongue, hymns so sweet and impressive that in the days of Alfred, two centuries later, some of them are remembered.

The poetry of Cedmon was a revelation to the people. It brought the sublime thoughts of the Bible within their grasp. It enlarged their views of Christian teachings. It solved in a manner, primitive enough, but satisfactory for them, some of the questionings that must have arisen in their souls on hearing recounted the history of God's wonders from the beginning. It gave palpable shape and form to many of the mysteries of religion. The rebellion of the angels; the fall of man; original sin, and its consequences, became henceforth no longer vague notions, but rather, living, present things to their minds. Is it not told how the angels fought and fell, and how they were punished? Is not their abode of torment described? And have we not the very words of Lucifer? And do we not listen to Adam and Eve discoursing over the apple? Are not the words that Satan spoke to Eve recorded therein? It is all a new mythology, substituted for the old, but it is a harmless one. It is a framing in which to group the truths of Christianity and the history of God's providences. Later the same framing will be slightly modified for a similar purpose, and it will be known as the Miracle-play. Milton will adopt it in his epic, and the popular mind will be educated to regard almost as positive truths the imaginary descriptions there given of things unseen.

It is noteworthy that there is no modern language so impregnated with Scriptural thought and colored with Scriptural allusions as is the English. It accommodates itself to the most solemn utterances. It has been so from the beginning. When St. Augustine lands in England he brings with him a small library of nine volumes. They are: 1, The Holy Bible, in two volumes; 2, the Psalter; 3, the Gospels; 4, another Psalter; 5, another copy of the Gospels; 6, the Apocryphal Lives of the Apostles; 7, the Lives of the Martyrs; 8, an Exposition of the Gospels and Epistles. *Hæc sunt primitiæ librorum totius Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, says the *Canterbury Book*.<sup>1</sup> Of these nine volumes, six are Scriptural and one explanatory of the Scriptures. True, these books are locked up in a language unknown to the people. It is the merit of Cedmon to have placed their contents before them in the only manner in which they would have reached their "business and bosoms." And henceforth the Old and New Testaments become popular. Henceforth, in a sense, they are the people's horn-books. Much of the old English poetry, afterwards, is all the more read for being Scriptural at least in name. We meet with a poem on Christ, one called

---

<sup>1</sup> Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries*, chap. ii. p. 100.



Judith ; another is a dialogue between Saturn and Solomon. Even the unknown Christian poet, who gives us the extant version of the poem of Beowulf, becomes so unmindful of the pagan people of whom he sings, that he introduces the Gleeman singing Cedmon's song of the creation :

And sound of harp was there ; sweet sang the poet ;  
 He told the origin of men from far—  
 Told that the Almighty wrought the earth—the plain  
 In beauty bright embraced by waters ;  
 And, victor-proved, the sun and moon did set—  
 Light-giving flames to dwellers on the land ;  
 And decked earth's varied parts with boughs and leaves ;  
 And eke created life of every kind.<sup>1</sup>

Thus it is that the poet preserves the tradition of his song. And the historian, in the person of the Venerable Bede, crystallizes in his immortal pages the glory and the greatness of his name, the loveliness and saintliness of his life. Nor is this all.

In the ninth century his poems became known in France. Louis the Pious introduced them. This good monarch, not content that the knowledge of the divine books be confined to the learned and erudite, resolved, and by the interposition of Providence it was so managed, that all his subjects speaking the German language should become familiar with them. So speaks the Latin Preface to the paraphrase.<sup>2</sup> And, in order to show how Providence aided the king, it adds : A certain person ordered a man of the Saxon race, who was esteemed a great poet, to devote himself to the poetical translation into the German, of the Old and the New Testaments, so that the sacred reading of the divine precepts be open to learned and ignorant alike.<sup>3</sup> There was no need for a new translation. The language of Cedmon was that of Louis. There might have been—as no doubt there were—slight variations of dialect ; but the people of one nation understood those of the other. Long previously had commercial relations been established between them. They were Franks whom St. Augustine took with him as interpreters, on his first going to England.<sup>4</sup> No doubt the Preface wished to pay a compliment to Louis, when it gave him the credit of or-

<sup>1</sup> Beowulf, i. 180, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> This Preface is found among Hincmar's letters : *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*. Labigne, Paris, 1654, t. xvi. p. 609. I have been unable to find it in the Migne Edition.

<sup>3</sup> *Preceptum namque quidam viro de gente Saxonum, qui apud suos non ignobilis vates habebatur, ut vetus ac novum Testamentum in Germanicam linguam poetice transferre studeret, quatenus non solum literatis, verum etiam illiteratis, sacra divinatorum præceptorum lectio panderetur.*—*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, ii. p. 278. For additional proof, see W. Howel, *Inst. Gen. Hist.* iv. p. 435.

dering the translation. Be this as it may, it adds the more important information that the poet sang from the creation of the world to the end of the Old and the New Testaments, interpreting and explaining as he went along so lucidly and elegantly that he delighted all who heard and understood. It then refers to his having received his powers in a dream. "It is said that this same poet, whilst yet entirely ignorant of his art, was admonished in a dream to arrange the precepts of the sacred law in a style suitable to his own tongue." This is evidently a tradition of the legend told by the Venerable Bede in the previous century. A poem attached to the Preface speaks still more clearly of his peasant origin.<sup>1</sup> That the poet was appreciated, may be learned from the rather fulsome praise of the Preface: "So great was the fluency of his words, so great shone the excellence of the matter, that his poetry surpassed all German poems by its polish. The diction is clear; clearer still is the sense."<sup>2</sup> And this, be it remembered, was no publisher's advertisement. It was written after the poems had been some time among the people. It only records a fact. They had already won popular favor. And after all it is scarcely less praise than that bestowed on them by Bede. True, the poet is not named in the Preface; but the coincidence in the lives of the poets, in the matters of their poetry, in the unanimous testimony to its excellence and influence, is too great not to admit of identity. Both are of the people; both are admonished in a dream to sing the sacred truths of religion; both sing of the creation; both paraphrase the Old and New Testaments; the productions of both are universally lauded. It is because both are one, and that one is Cedmon.

And now, it would seem as though his spirit continued to live and labor through the whole Teutonic race. In France and Germany, as well as in England, Scripture paraphrasings became the popular rage. They are the drama and the novel of the people. They are more. They are not read or listened to for amusement's sake. They are pored over and dwelt upon with passionate earnestness, to be lived and acted out. Through them, the people become familiarized with the thoughts and deeds of the Redeemer, and learn to follow them more closely. Some of these old horn-books of that day have come down to us. We have the poem called *Krist*;<sup>3</sup> we have a song of the Samaritan Woman;<sup>4</sup> we have a poem on the Last Judgment;<sup>5</sup> translations of several psalms, and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Incipe divinas recitare ex ordine leges,  
Transferre in propriam clarissima dogmata linguam;  
Nec mora, post tanti fuerat miracula dicti:  
Qui prius Agricola, mox et fuit ille Poeta.*

*Versus de Poeta, et interprete hujus Codicis.* Bib. Patr., *loc cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.    <sup>3</sup> Ottfried, Koenigsberg, 1831.    <sup>4</sup> Schiller, Thesaurus, II.    <sup>5</sup> Ibid.

a harmony of the four Gospels, called Heliand.<sup>1</sup> This last was widely known and highly prized. There are extant traditions of its popularity in Germany and England.<sup>2</sup> It is written in a dialect to be understood by both nations. There has been much conjecture as to the authorship. Schmeller thinks it was written by an English missionary. Grein wished to identify it with that of the translation made in the time of Louis the Pious, but with no success. Evidently this version is of the ninth century, and the production of some ecclesiastic intimate with the Scriptures, and at least aware of the apocryphal Gospels; for he tells us that many disciples of Christ endeavored to write God's holy word with their own hands in a magnificent book; only four were chosen, and to them were given "God's power, help from heaven, the Holy Spirit, and strength from Christ: *maht godes helpa fan himila helagna gest craft fan christæ*." Now, be it remembered that about the time this form of poetry became so general, English missionaries returned to christianize their kinsfolk in the old homestead; hosts of them, under Willibrord and Boniface, invaded Friesland and Germany, bringing with them the light and life of the Gospel and the Church. They were not unmindful of the experience and traditions of other days in their own country; that which was so skilful a weapon in the hands of Cedmon, and Aldhelm, and Bede himself, they did not neglect. It may have been the same songs they repeated; it was certainly the same in sense, and in the same spirit, that they sang. It is Cedmon who still speaks.

Nor is he forgotten later. The sole manuscript of his works that is known to be extant is of the tenth century, and even that is fragmentary. It is divided into two books, and of these only the first is continuous; the second is hopelessly broken up. The MS. is in the Bodleian Library. It is illuminated. Some of the scenes represented are evidently those which, in that early day, must have been enacted in the Miracle-plays.<sup>3</sup> The tradition of the creation and fall, as preserved in these plays, is that handed down by Cedmon. But in this manuscript we must not look for the identical poem that Cedmon sang. In passing from generation to generation for three centuries, various changes must have imperceptibly entered into the text. A version in the West-Saxon dialect might not conform to that in the Northumbrian; meddlesome scribes

<sup>1</sup> J. Andreas Schmeller, Stuttgart, 1830. This is mainly a print of the Cotton MS. in the British Museum.

<sup>2</sup> Poema istud non solum in Anglia, sed etiam in Germania et quidem Wirceburgi extare, teste G. Eccardo (in Monum. vet. Quaternione Lipsiæ MDCCXX. fol. 42, et in Comm. de rebus Franciæ or. MDCCXXIV. tom. ii. fol. 325), jam pridem inter antiquitatum curiosos rumor fuerat.—*Schmeller, Prefatio Editoris*, p. viii.

<sup>3</sup> This places Miracle-plays a century earlier than the date usually assigned to them.

might occasionally undertake to improve the poem; others again might be too ignorant to write it correctly; and so from one cause to another, while the general tenor would remain, special passages might read differently. This accounts for the discrepancies in the reading of the opening lines of the poem, as found in King Alfred's translation of the Venerable Bede's Ecclesiastical History, and in the manuscript. No doubt, Cedmon would be at some trouble to identify the songs he sang with the present transcript of them. But he is not alone in this respect. Imagine Tasso coming among the gondoliers of Venice as they chant his Jerusalem Delivered. And would not Shakspeare and Æschylus be equally at a loss to recognize in our modern texts of their masterpieces the verses they indited? The MS. belonged to Usher, who gave it to Francis Junius or Dejon. This latter it was that assigned the poem to Cedmon, and as Cedmon's had it printed in 1655. And Dejon had a friend to whom he communicated his literary projects; that friend was then in his forty-seventh year, and was meditating a grand epic; he saw this MS.; no doubt he possessed a copy of the printed poem; it decided his subject and its treatment; the materials he had collected for a Miracle-play he made use of in this new project, and forthwith he produced a work of great genius. That man was Milton, the poem was *Paradise Lost*.<sup>1</sup>

Here terminates the direct and immediate influence of Cedmon. Beyond whatever of expression and allusion may have been preserved by Milton, or passed into our thinking, that influence is for us dead. We may rehabilitate his life and imagine the times in which it was spent; but those times are past, and with them the magnetism of his influence. It remains but as a record. His poetry has no responsive chord in the modern heart. Another poet must come amongst us, with faith as lively and genius as brilliant, whose song shall thrill the age, and whose burning words will thaw out the ice of skepticism that is settling upon it hard and fast.

---

<sup>1</sup> Johnson's Life of Milton, Works, vol. ii. p. 33.

## THE HUMAN SOUL AND BODY.

THEIR UNION CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO DIFFERENT THEORIES  
FOR EXPLAINING THE NATURE OF MATERIAL SUBSTANCE.

“Where there is no knowledge of the soul, there is no good.”—PROV. xix. 2.

THE hypothesis which any one adopts in philosophizing about the union between man's soul and body, must depend not only on the theory employed by him for explaining the nature of the soul itself, but also on the theory followed by him in explaining the essential constitution of matter, or the nature of material substance. This union of soul and body in man has, at the best, its obscurity and mysteriousness, as St. Augustine observed (*De Civitate Dei*, lib. 21, cap. 10), and as acknowledged by all the greatest Christian philosophers; but yet there are some general truths bearing on the subject which can be known by natural reason, more or less clearly and distinctly, and which it is good not to allow the “scientists” or modern “scientism” to involve in doubt and darkness.

Pure materialism can scarcely be recognized as constituting any genuine system of philosophy at all; for the spirituality of the human soul is among the first truths which it is the office of philosophy to demonstrate, and it is then treated as a fundamental principle in every system; the schools of philosophy dividing, not on this truth of the soul's immaterial and spiritual nature, but rather on the consequences derivable from it. The materialist denies that man has any principle in the composition of his nature that is not purely material; and he asserts, therefore, that man has no spiritual soul, he is only body. It follows, then, that the present inquiry concerning the nature of the human compound, or the nature of that union which is between man's soul and body, cannot be addressed directly to the materialist; the spirituality of the human soul is here supposed, and as he denies that truth he must be left to pursue his own investigations, “with the snout of grovelling appetite,” into “dirt philosophy.” Materialism may be justly characterized as the lowest and grossest type of thought or learning which lays claim to be called speculative science and reasoning; pure idealism, an opposite extreme, is the absurdest and most abhorrent to reason. As the idealist denies the objective reality of things external to the mind, neither can the subject herein proposed be rightly discussed with him; for he more completely than even the materialist repudiates all the realities and all the first principles which must be postulated, when the question to be

argued is, what is the nature of that union which is between man's soul and body?

But even among those who admit, or, at least, do not deny, that there is a principle in man superior to mere matter; that man's ideas are objectively real, and, consequently that the outer world is made up of physical realities, there are many theories proposed for explaining the intrinsic nature of the visible substances around us; and it is no wonder, then, that the advocates of those conflicting theories hold very divergent opinions concerning man as having a nature that is both corporeal and intellectual. These various systems, devised to explain the nature and essential constituents of material objects, may be ranged with, perhaps, sufficient comprehensiveness, under three principal classes, or three leading hypotheses. 1st. The hypothesis according to which the ultimate elements or components of bodies are really simple entities. 2d. The theory which reduces all the visible creation to persistent force, and the modifications of this one persistent force. 3d. The theory that matter or body is, of its nature, a compound substance, which is really and physically extended. It is plain that these theories must furnish very different answers to the questions: How is man at the same time both corporeal and intellectual in his nature? Are matter and spirit so united in man as to constitute him one nature, one personal being? Are matter and spirit associated in companionship, by an accidental and extrinsic union, without constituting a compound nature that is really one? Are soul and body commingled; or are they united into one substance chemically, as oxygen and hydrogen unite chemically, so as to constitute one substance, water?

It is not proposed, in this article, minutely to state and describe the theories of matter above classified, nor to recount the manifold systems which may be included under these heads. But it will not be amiss here to consider some general truths which cannot be ignored, not only if we would reason correctly concerning the nature and essential constituents of material substance, but also, if we would rightly conceive the unity of man's nature, especially as no argumentation on any subject can lead to valid results, which starts from erroneous first principles, or from premises false in fact. This subject of inquiry is one in which Bacon's celebrated rule of induction has legitimate application; for surely no theory for explaining the intrinsic nature of matter is genuine or really valid, which is not a logical deduction from known facts. An hypothesis that is arbitrarily assumed *a priori*, must either directly deny evident facts, or else it must, with Procrustean violence, force those facts into required shapes and dimensions; for example, Fichte chooses to assume that the human mind makes the objects of its own ideas,

and that external things could have no share in the production of those ideas; it is, therefore, denied by him that the objects of thought possess any other reality than that which is subjective to the mind having those thoughts. This is a sweeping denial of facts, which is made in order to meet the requirements of theory.

The human mind naturally comes to the knowledge of things really and physically existing, only by means of their action and the effects produced by that action. Man can know a cause to be simple by first knowing its effects to be such as none but a simple cause can produce; just as he can also know a cause to be complex or compound by means of its effects; as, for example, when the geologist observes in the strata of the earth's surface effects which he may legitimately conclude could have been produced only by the combined agency of heat, air, and water. This relationship of cause and effect, by which one is distinguished from the other, and by which the one being apprehended the other thereby becomes known, is evident to our minds, and it is perceived by way of a primitive fact, just as color is perceived through the eye by way of primitive fact. Hence, inductive reasoning is based on this general principle as its logical criterion: we may legitimately conclude from actual effects to their cause or sufficient reason. Applying this method of reasoning, which our minds naturally pursue whenever we investigate facts, to the study of man's nature, we may analyze that nature, and learn by means of its various action the real components or constituent principles of that nature. Following this logical process, the great mass of mankind have always agreed upon a few well-known general conclusions; as, for example, man's body, in common with the mineral, has specific gravity, reflects light, has quantity or volume, etc.; in common with the vegetable, it has vital growth, by intussusception and assimilation of nutriment; in common with the brute or irrational animal, it has sensation, self-locomotion; finally, what is peculiar and specific to man among all objects of the visible creation, he judges intellectually, reasons, knows the supersensible, and wills deliberately. Since man thus combines in himself all grades of perfection that are discernible in the universe, he is not inappropriately styled a "microcosm," or "little world," "the epitome of creation."

The desire for change, or fondness for what is new, may happen to be as disastrous to the cause of genuine philosophical truth (and genuine truth is in itself not subject to mutation), as it has sometimes proved to be to the efficacy of unchangeable principles in the moral order. It is not more strange for Cicero to comment on the fact noticed by him, that no hypothesis is so absurd as not to have been defended by some philosopher, than it is to find Sallust to have reprovèd the generation of his day for seeking after

change and novelties in the civil and social order. Even then as in the day of our keenest English satirist, it might have been said of minds tired of evident truths admitted by all candid thinkers :

“ So, schismatics the plain believers quit,  
And are but damned for having too much wit.”

That hypothesis surely exacts too much, which requires us to reject the plain well-known conclusions of common sense for the sake of theory. Doubtless Laménais was absurd in maintaining that the common consent of mankind is the ultimate criterion of all certainty; for this ultimate standard or motive of certainty must be something internal and subjective to our minds, not something merely extrinsic. It is generally agreed among sounder philosophers and more correct reasoners, belonging to every school of opinions, that the ultimate motive and criterion of all certainty is reducible to evidence possessed by the mind: in physical and metaphysical matter, it is evidence coming from the object to the mind, either immediately, as happens when the truth or object is self-evident; or else mediately, as happens when that truth or object becomes known only by means of demonstration, or by reasoning to it from other truths that are evident to the mind. In moral certainty, this ultimate criterion of truth is evidence that the testimony is credible.

Laménais's theory of certainty, then, is not tenable; but, nevertheless, it is undeniable that the testimony of good common sense has its own order or species of objects within which it may give unerring certainty; and of such objects are all those plain sensible facts with the obvious first conclusions from them, which are known to all persons of ordinary experience and ability to judge. To deny or call in question this testimony of the human faculties to truths and objects the most immediately and evidently known to them, is not to philosophize; it is to do away with what genuine philosophy must regard as being a first principle in its own order.

Is it a fact that mankind at large attributes to matter some predicates as common to all forms of material substance, and that such predicates express the obvious first judgments which the human mind naturally or instinctively forms and affirms of what it perceives through the senses? Are there self-evident facts concerning sensible qualities or properties inhering in all bodies of matter, which science cannot legitimately explain away, but which some “scientists” claim to explain away?

It is a fact that the great mass of mankind do give predicates of the sort to all forms of material substances falling under their senses; and it seems to be equally a fact that, if the human faculties are false or erroneous in these first and direct acts of cogni-



tion, then, all science and philosophy, so far as they concern matter, are reducible to mere idealism and baseless speculation.

Let us apply the preceding principles to a consideration of the human compound, or to man's nature as consisting of both matter and spirit. Viewing the question only in the light of unaided natural reason, which theory best serves to explain satisfactorily man's nature as being both corporeal and intellectual: the theory that "all things are force with the modifications of force," the theory that "all matter or body is composed of simple elements," or the theory which teaches that "matter or body is, of its nature, really and physically extended?"

It is plain that the theory which one adopts in order to account for the manner in which spirit and matter are combined in man, must be based, in part, at least, on the hypothesis employed by him to explain material substance or body; as it will depend also on what such one conceives the human soul to be. This statement presents the subject as an extensive one; too extensive to be herein fully treated. Besides, this whole question, as to the nature of body, the precise manner in which spirit and matter unite so as to constitute the human compound or man, is disputed, even in the schools of the Church. Discussion conducted in a right spirit, helps the cause of truth; with the desire of contributing something towards so commendable a work, the writer here ventures, with much deference for the opinions of those who may think differently from himself, to give some reasons why one of those theories seems preferable to the others.

It is difficult to comprehend what either the soul or body is, or how they unite in man, if they must be conceived and defined in accordance with the theory of *force*. It is true, that there are two schools of theorists who propound the doctrine of *force*: first, they who, with Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, etc., dispatch in a few words, all questions concerning the nature of the human soul as a spiritual substance, as they do all subjects pertaining to God as a personal being, by pronouncing them to be *unknowable*. A second school of theorists hold that all bodies may be reduced to force and its modifications, but, at the same time, they admit the human soul to be a substantial and spiritual nature.

Locke, in his essay on Human Understanding, rather aims to show what the mind of man does not know, and cannot know, than to explain things that can be known and comprehended by us; his subject is more properly the unknowable than it is the knowable. In this, Locke gave origin to a new conception and new *style* of philosophizing; this style yet prevails, and it is as plainly discernible in the writings of Mill as in those of Locke himself. To brand a rejected thesis as pertaining to the "unknowable," and

then, with Huxley, class it among "questions of lunar politics," or with Maudsley put it among "fruitless controversies in barren metaphysics," is thus made an easy and compendious method of solving all troublesome difficulties. Locke consigns to this category of the unknowable the question, whether or not mere matter or body can think intellectually? The atheistic author of a recent volume on "Theism" sneers at the absurdity into which this assertion betrays Locke when subsequently attempting to demonstrate the existence of God as the spiritual and intelligent first cause; he refutes Locke's argument for the existence of God, by using for the purpose Locke's own doctrine of the unknowable. But is not this *force* itself, which comprises every capability, of which all phenomena are but "modifications," and which suffices to account for all knowable things, also something quite unknowable? Either this force is something subsistent, as substance is, or it is not; if it is, then what is gained for philosophy or science by changing the name of substance to that of "force," which, as generally conceived, is only a property or accident of substance? If it is not substance, and yet everything is force, then truly, in the phraseology of Locke, the master among "scientists," is it "something inconceivable by our minds." What can be more "unknowable" than "force," which does not exist alone or by itself, like substance; which does not inhere in any subject, and nevertheless is everything? Among unknowable things, nothing is so unknowable. But let us state the principle on which this theory of "force" is based. There is one persistent force; persistent, because it never gains or loses any real force; its chief "modifications," or quasi species, are heat, light, electricity, nerve force, chemical force, momentum of bodies in motion, and energy of position. The theory does not attempt to account for difference in the species of things, nor does it explain how there can come from this obscure entity, styled "force," separate and complete things, of the same species; it thus reduces all objects to the category of the unknowable.

The union of man's soul and body, conceived in accordance with the principles of such doctrine and expressed in its terms, can propose no object to the mind which is not utterly incomprehensible. To this difficulty, however, Mill, in his *Logic*, Introduction, and in Chapter III., on "substance," gives the answer for the "scientists" of this school, when he asserts the impossibility of proving the existence of matter or spirit, or of knowing what they are really. It is sure this theory of force gives no explanation of the subject, it can give none; it can only deny that soul or matter is knowable, and pronounce gratuitously that the nature of the

union between man's soul and body, is consequently something unknowable.

But omitting further controversy with the theory of force, which certainly affords no adequate explanation of the manner in which matter and spirit combine and coexist so as to constitute the personal being, man the question may be here asked, which of the two other systems better solves all difficulties growing out of the subject; that of "simple elements," or the system maintaining that matter or body is really and physically extended? Which of these two theories accounts more consistently for what we evidently and certainly know concerning reason in man, and his corporeal nature? It is plain that these two systems exclude each other; they cannot both be true; nor, therefore, is it possible that they should harmonize equally well with what we positively, or as a fact, know of matter and spirit.

Matter has certain properties or predicates which are truly and really in every form of matter, whether it be only mineral, or be organized and living; and it is by means of these real qualities that we actually know bodies. Some of these predicates which are common to all forms of matter can be evidently and positively known by mankind at large, and, as a fact, they are thus known to every one of average ability to perceive and judge. Can genuine philosophy demonstrate *a priori* that these qualities which mankind attribute to all matter as perceived through their senses, are unreal or false?

If the mass of men, throughout ages, and now to-day, fall into *error of fact*, in their first obvious judgments as to what they actually and evidently perceive through their senses, then we have left no certain principle concerning sensible objects on which to reason against idealism or skepticism. If this direct and immediate testimony of the human faculties to fact, is false in every man, and in all men, then surely enough are science and philosophy of real things reduced to empty speculation about meaningless abstractions. The testimony of the senses to sensible facts, and also the obvious first judgments that affirm those facts, are among the special or peculiar objects to which common sense applies; and, as thus understood, it is a witness to positive things, to the positive premise in philosophizing, which cannot be gainsaid or doubted without disastrous consequences to any hypothesis which has to be defended by denying or explaining its testimony away. This was always verified in the past, from the days of Pyrrho in Athens, to those of Berkeley and Hume in England.

Is real extension in matter by way of *physicum continuum*, one of those predicates which, as a fact, the mass of mankind give to bodies falling evidently under the cognizance of their senses? It

is not denied that mankind do thus apprehend and judge of matter or body; "but," it is alleged, "mankind judge erroneously the fact which they perceive; for, what they take to be real and physical extension, is only a phenomenon which they misconceive. The people ridicule the philosopher who proves that there can be no real mathematical extension in matter, as an idealist, as visionary and eccentric, because they suppose him to deny also the phenomenon which they see evidently, namely, phenomenal extension." But here it might be asked, which is the appointed and reliable means of learning this primitive and positive fact; is it our natural faculties perceiving it directly and immediately through its own evidence, or is it an abstract hypothesis claiming to demonstrate *a priori* what it is we must see? And this inquiry is all the more pertinent, when it is question, as in the present case, of a predicate or property of matter which is "a common sensible," as it is styled; for, the "common sensible" is perceivable through more senses than one, and, therefore, our means of knowing it completely, through the senses, is all the more perfect. It is further urged that "these obvious first judgments affirming primitive sensible facts, are sometimes plainly erroneous; as, for example, before the rotary motion of the earth on its axis was discovered, the sun was said to *rise* and to *set*, thereby affirming that it was the sun which moved."

This fact, however, of the inference made by men, from what they saw, that the sun moved, is not at all relevant to the point; for the first obvious judgment affirmed by men on the testimony of their senses was *real motion*; their reasoning, inference, or opinion as to the cause of that motion, is beside the present question. In order for that fact to be a pertinent objection against the principle herein defended, it would be necessary to show that mankind was also deceived as to seeing any *real motion*, by which the sun was now at the horizon, now on the meridian of the observer's place, etc. In like manner mankind have always perceived through their senses *real extension* in matter or body; and just as real motion was the sensible object seen and affirmed, in the one case, so is real extension the object directly perceived and affirmed in the other. The science of astronomy subsequently explained the nature or cause of that real motion, but it could not prove that there was no motion; in like manner, the science of physics may ultimately explain the nature or cause of real extension in matter, but it can never discover that there is no real extension in matter.

It belongs to science and philosophy to investigate the causes of primitive facts knowable through man's natural faculties; but it is a poor theory which requires for its defence the denying or explaining away of those facts. The defenders of the "force" theory

profess not to deny the reality of extension in matter or body ; but they affirm it to be only a modification or phenomenon of force. In the theory of " simple elements," extension as physically continuous, is not a real predicate of matter at all ; it is not a property that is really inherent in matter or body ; but yet body occupies extension, the simple elements of which a body is constituted being as a collection of mathematical points separated by small intervening spaces. These simple elements, composing body, are kept in their relation to each other by duly balanced attraction and repulsion ; they are *in* mathematical extension, therefore, but they have no extension.

In order to conceive " body " as thus composed, then it becomes necessary to explain away physical quantity or real extension, as being any real property of matter, and consequently to deny that we can perceive such property through our senses. In the theory, physical continuous extension as a *real* predicate or property of matter, does not exist, and it cannot exist. It is not claimed that experimental science furnishes demonstrative proof of this assertion ; for experimental science is limited to matter as an object of the senses, and the senses apprehend matter only as having extension. The defenders of the system claim to demonstrate theoretically and *a priori* that it is impossible, in the very nature of things, for matter to be *really extended*. The mass of mankind would answer, " we see evidently through our senses that matter or body is really extended," and " facts are stubborn things." Indeed, the " fact " is here the refutation of theory.

But what argument demonstrates apodictically the impossibility of real and physical extension in matter ? If such thing can be thus demonstrated at all, it can be done by one argument, for when a conclusion is true, as following from the very nature of things, or *a priori*, the medium of demonstration, or the reason, is really one ;<sup>1</sup> then, what is that one necessary and conclusive reason ? There is no such proof to be given, and consequently, " the system of simple

---

<sup>1</sup> " In speculativis medium demonstrationis, quod perfecte demonstrat conclusionem, est unum tantum ; sed media probabilia sunt multa. Et similiter in operativis quando id quod est ad finem, adæquat, ut ita dixerim, finem, non requiritur quod sit nisi unum tantum." St. Thomas's *Summa*, p. 1, qu. 47, a. 2 ad 3. In the speculative order (or order of necessary truth), the medium of demonstration, which demonstrates the conclusion perfectly, is only one. Similarly in practical things also when the means to an end, so to say it, equals that end, there is required only one means to that end.

In other words, there is one, and only one demonstration for any conclusion following by necessary sequence from principles that are absolutely true ; and this holds, whether that conclusion be one which follows immediately from the principles, or one which is deduced by valid and necessary sequence, as more remote ; for, " the medium of demonstration " may consist of several arguments, one following through another as its medium.

elements " cannot rightfully claim to offer what is, at the best, more than a plausible or probable hypothesis for explaining the composition of bodies.

There are those, however, who contend that a conclusive reason why matter cannot, in the nature of things, be really extended, is because in such hypothesis, matter should be infinitely divisible, whereas this infinite divisibility of matter is something impossible, or it would lead to absurd consequences. It does not necessarily follow, however, that "matter being really extended, matter is therefore infinitely divisible," since the existence of any body of matter could, by the choice of God, be made actually dependent on a particular degree of real quantity or extension. But even admitting that we may predicate of matter as really extended, infinite divisibility by way of infinite series, what absurdity thence follows? All real extension as extension is thus divisible, as the textbooks of mathematics explain; but what essential difference is there between the difficulty of comprehending clearly infinite divisibility as a true predicate of the mathematical line, surface, or solid really described by movement of your hand, and that of comprehending infinite divisibility as a true predicate of this or that quantity of matter really extended? No absurd consequence follows from predicating infinite divisibility in either case; for such division can never become actually infinite, either in the one or in the other. All mere logical difficulty concerning this point is obviated for him who understands the axiom which is here to be applied: "from the indefinite infinite to the actual infinite there is no illation;" infinite divisibility can never reach infinite actual division, since these two things mutually exclude each other. It follows, then, that the *infinite* can never be an actual predicate or property of any quantity, whether physical and real quantity or only mathematical; and thus the objection becomes a mere equivocation on the words "infinite divisibility," which neither assert nor imply that body, as really extended, must, on that account, be actually susceptible of the predicate, infinite, under any possible respect. Besides, if we assume that matter or body is not really extended, would we, or even could we then perceive it through our senses, just as we now actually perceive it? Or, supposing matter or body to be really extended, would we, or even could we then perceive it through our senses in a different manner from that in which we actually perceive it? The idealist evades argumentation which concerns external objects; he denies objective realities and the facts furnished by them; he devises, instead, ideas, which he can more easily explain than he can objects not produced by him; for those ideas are figments of his own, which he trims, amends, or adds to, as required for maintaining their factitious consistency.

How shall we account for the different species of matter or bodies, in the hypothesis that all matter is composed of simple elements? Much must be explained away before the theory can be fitted to meet that difficulty. Moreover, in that theory, either these simple elements act at a distance, or they do not; if the former be required by the theory, it is absurd, as against the evident axiom, "*nihil agit in distans*," nothing can act at a distance. If the latter be admitted by the theory, then the simple elements are united by a real medium, which is really and physically extended; but this, however, contradicts the fundamental principle of the theory, namely, that real extension in matter is impossible.

If we suppose a body to be before us, composed, in accordance with the theory, only of simple elements, it is difficult even to conceive how such a collection of entities, in themselves really simple, can, by being placed in the vicinity of each other, become an object of the senses. In such a supposition all the terms now employed to express the realities in matter or body as perceived evidently through the senses and affirmed by obvious first judgments of reason, must actually express an erroneous meaning. But truly the faculties of mankind are not deceived in their direct and natural act of perceiving their own objects, when those objects are intuitively evident to them.

Some theories proposed in recent times for explaining the nature of matter and the composition of bodies obscure and weaken, if indeed they do not tend totally to destroy, all the main arguments for demonstrating the immateriality and spirituality of the human soul. Such systems have helped not a little to confirm many minds in their adhesion to Locke's opinion, who asserts that material substance is unknowable, and that reason is unable to demonstrate the impossibility for matter or body to think intellectually. This happens all the more easily since some of those hypotheses, as before said, either deny or else explain away many predicates or properties of matter which were always commonly given to it by mankind, and which at the same time were heretofore regarded as certainly distinguishing material substance or body from spiritual substance. If any matter is in itself simple and subsistent, and such the simple elements are held to be, then how shall we demonstrate the falsity of Mr. Locke's words, that "for aught we know, matter is susceptible of intellectual power and thought?" What becomes of the argument for the soul's spirituality, founded on its properties and action as a simple substance? The evident qualities of all matter, and the distinctive characteristics of reason, or of intellectual action, are known by way of first facts and judgments. To deny or doubt them, with the idealist or skeptic, is to give up truths that serve as first principles for explaining the nature of the

human soul and discriminating between spirit and matter. If these plain facts and truths are really deceptive and uncertain, or merely present phenomena which are erroneously conceived by the minds of men, on what then shall we base a genuine distinction between matter and spirit?

The difficulties raised up by these new hypotheses, in regard to the distinction between matter and spirit, lead to the further and consequent difficulty of accounting by them for the union of the material and the intellectual principles in man. Tyndall, whose doctrine seems to combine the "force" theory with "positivism," passes by this difficulty in the *Nineteenth Century*, for November, 1878, as unanswerable; yet he claims that science will finally explain how matter can think intellectually. Others of his school simply remit the whole subject to questions belonging to the category of the unknowable — that dark pit to which Herbert Spencer also consigns all inquiry concerning the existence of a personal God.

It will not be amiss, perhaps, if this point in Spencer's doctrine be here stated, in a passing way: Spencer contends that God, as He is usually conceived by men, is only an anthropomorphous God: that is, God, as generally conceived by the human mind, is only a man fully perfected in his species.<sup>1</sup> One aim of Spencer's

<sup>1</sup> It has been proposed among the learned, more than once, rigorously to banish all figurative terms from the language of philosophy or metaphysics. Dugald Stewart once favored such an undertaking; but subsequently, on more mature thought, he concluded, with D'Alembert, that "the total proscription of figurative terms from all abstract discussions," was merely a visionary project, and not reducible to practice. (Collected Works of Dugald Stewart, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1877, vol. iv. part iii. chapter ii section iii.) A style that is ornamented with tropes and figures, is gross and unprecise in philosophy; yet all terms used by us in reasoning from visible or sensible things, to the supersensible or abstract order of objects, have more or less of an analogical meaning, since it is only by means of analogies and relations that our minds make the transition from one order to the other.

Those "scientists" of the present day who defend materialism, desire, with Maudsley (see preface to *Body and Mind*) to interdict all "words which have meanings of a metaphysical kind attached to them." Both of these schemes to change language, but founded on contrary reasons, however, are mere conceits, proposing what is wholly impractical; for, first, those designs are based on what is false; and, secondly, the natural good sense of mankind cannot be led into extravagances of that sort, since such changes would upset both their thought and language.

The general tendency of sound thinkers who treat abstract and metaphysical questions is towards a certain unity of terminology in philosophy, on the basis of the ancient classic languages, especially the Latin, from which most of the borrowed terms used by metaphysicians are derived. This tendency is opposed by the school of erratic essayists who are for "no dogma," and who prefer to contemplate stern truth as mitigated with some vagueness and obscurity of the words in which it is enunciated. As an example: for how many fallacies do they not prepare the way, by confounding the signification of "mind" with that of "soul," of "believe" with that of "know?" Ballerini gives a similar instance of effort made to render words obscure or equivocal, the words chosen for the purpose being "actus humanus" and "actus hominis." Words with their



philosophy, of all genuine philosophy, his followers assert, is, as called by Mr. Fiske, in his *Cosmic Philosophy*, the *deanthropomorphization* of God; to which it may be added, in a corresponding jumble of Latin and Greek, that it is, moreover, the *detheozation* of God, by burying Him in outer darkness, among the condemned objects making up the comprehensive and convenient category of the unknowable. Spencer's reasoning on this subject is subtle, and it is specious enough actually to have deceived some, among whom may be included Fiske; but, in reality, it amounts to what is merely an equivocation. It is true that we reach our idea of God, with His attributes, by analogical reasoning; but it is not true to say that therefore a personal God, as conceived by us, is of man's nature, or that He has, as conceived by our minds, any attribute common to Him and man; for He transcends all genus and species, as actually conceived by us. Analogical unity does not suppose real identity of attribute, for then it would be, not analogy at all, but similarity, between the objects compared. God and creature agree by analogy which is transcendental; the note in which they agree has not a univocal meaning or name in God and creature. Analogy may be intrinsic to one of its terms, without being at all intrinsic to the other; as, for example, a *healthy* man, a *healthy* climate. Thus, analogy may relate objects to one another which are of a totally different order. Creatures are truly related to God, and by means of that relation we can reason from creatures to God; but in doing so we wholly abstract from, or drop from our conclusion to God, all predicate of what is real in creatures, since we use no term as univocal in its application to creature and to God. Had Spencer considered the nature of analogy more thoroughly, as, for example, that between ideas and their physical objects, the agreement of words and things, etc., he would, perhaps, have interpreted differently the language of his supposed watch, as speaking intelligently of things belonging to a higher species than itself, in terms of watch-wheels, springs, lever, crystal, hands, etc.

It must be admitted, then, that the theories of material substance

---

meanings thus craftily perplexed, are like counterfeit coins. An opposite class of minds have argued that metaphysical and theological questions should be discussed only in the Latin language, in imitation of Brahminical exclusiveness for Sanscrit.

There is a degree of truth implied, at least, in all these extreme notions; but yet, they are extreme opinions, and the simple truth is midway between them. The Church adopts the Latin language in her ritual, her doctrinal decisions, and in all her official utterances; for the words of a fixed language do not change their meaning or become equivocal. For wise reasons, aspirants to the priesthood are taught philosophy and theology mainly in the Latin language. But the Church does not prescribe a language in which her children must think, speak, and write their philosophical or theological speculations. That is left to be determined by custom, education, actual expediency, and the like.

which deny or explain away all those real and obvious facts of matter on which reasoning must rest, leave little to be said by them on the subject, except that we know nothing either of soul or body, and therefore we cannot say with any certainty what they are: whether they are anything real, whether they are distinct or identical. For them the question, "how are man's soul and body united?" has little value and even little meaning.

Among those theorists who admit real extension as an inherent property of matter, and other qualities and accidents of matter to be just what they are judged to be, as facts, by mankind perceiving them through their senses, there are various and very different hypotheses proposed for explaining the essential constitution of matter or the nature of bodies. The aim of this article does not require, nor would its limits permit, those different systems to be here stated and discussed. It suffices for the purpose and whole object herein intended that all those theories hold the sensible qualities and properties of matter or body to be really what they are perceived through the senses to be.

Among those who admit, explicitly or impliedly, the reality of sensible qualities in matter as conceived by mankind on the testimony of their senses, there is also much diversity of opinion concerning the nature of the union between the human soul and body.

With this class of thinkers it is a common form of expression to style the body "the tenement of the soul," "the prison of the soul," "the instrument of the soul," and the like. The idea of the soul being in the body and ruling over it as an intelligent and living principle is possessed by all; but the manner of its indwelling there is something of which many have but vague and obscure notions. Even in our standard English literature, taken all in all, language often occurs which leaves no doubt of its being a prevailing notion that the soul's union with the body is an extrinsic one, and not an intrinsic union in composition so as to constitute of soul and body one living substantial nature, one personal being. The soul and body are usually spoken of as acting and reacting on each other, as mutually communicating influences received, etc. But it is plain that those who employ such language conceive the soul and body to have this facility of influencing each other, owing merely to their close proximity, the body being the dwelling-place of the soul, as the room is tenanted by a person, or, perhaps, somewhat as the shell is tenanted by the snail or lobster. In this manner of conceiving the connection between soul and body they are made completely distinct and really separate from each other, having only accidental union that arises from juxtaposition in place. It is thus the "theory of physical influence" explains the union of soul and body in man.

This "theory of physical influence," as it is styled, is usually ascribed to Euler; but its principle had been laid down by Locke before Euler's time. Locke's language concerning the nature of matter and spirit, and the manner in which they unite in man, was challenged at the time by the Bishop of Worcester, who imputed to Locke materialistic tendencies. Some of Locke's remarks objected to by the bishop, were as follows: "We have ideas of matter and thinking, but possibly shall never be able to know whether any mere material being thinks or no; it being impossible for us, by contemplation of our own ideas, without revelation, to discover whether Omnipotency has not given to some systems of matter fitly disposed, a power to perceive and think, or else *joined and fixed to matter so disposed a thinking immaterial substance*; it being in respect of our notions not much more remote from our comprehension to conceive that God can, if He pleases, superadd to matter a faculty of thinking, than that He should superadd to it another substance with a faculty of thinking." Book iv., Chapter iii., No. 6.

This passage, along with the defence of it against the bishop's objections, which Mr. Locke subsequently wrote and appended to his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding," led his followers to adopt the principle of "physical influence," in accounting for the connection between the soul and body of man. Euler, who was not born when Locke died, was the first, however, to propose and defend this doctrine, as reduced to a special and carefully elaborated system under its present name. It is manifest that in this hypothesis, man is not one being, not some one, subsisting in body and soul constituting one nature; but even as man precisely, he is really two beings merely adjoined or associated, with power mutually to act and be acted on; and consequently the theory denies any real unity in man's nature as a rational animal, or as a personal being.

Some theorists have affirmed that it is physically impossible for matter and spirit to have any action and reaction on each other, though they do not directly deny either the spirituality of the soul, or any of the common predicates of matter as generally admitted among men. There are two principal schools of authors who thus think concerning spirit and matter; namely, they who defend the theory of "occasional causes," as best explaining the respective action of soul and body in man, and they who prefer, for that purpose, "the theory of pre-established harmony."

The "system of occasional causes," which is also styled "the theory of assistance," is sometimes attributed to Descartes as its originator, but with doubtful justice; for, others deduce from his language, which, however, in respect to this subject, is not wholly free from obscurity, that he, like Locke, held the doctrine of "phys-

ical influence." But this theory of occasional causes, as employed to explain the concurrence or agreement in the actions of man's soul and body, and the mutual dependence which they seem to have, is more correctly ascribed to Malebranche, who, as a fact, proposed and defended it explicitly and at length. According to his hypothesis, when any affections of the soul require corresponding action in the body or its members, and also when any influence is exercised by exterior objects on the body or its senses, which should have corresponding action in the soul, then God Himself, *on occasion* of this necessity for agreement in the action of man's soul and body, produces, as first cause, the respondent impression or action. The reason given in proof is that neither the soul nor the body can act at all, unless moved to it by the first cause; and still less are they capable of acting on each other, since spirit and matter differ from one another according to their entire species, or in all their specific powers and properties. It is manifest, however, that this reasoning proves too much, and it is therefore null; for, the *fact* is well known that man's body and soul communicate by action, which is really his own.

Leibnitz also assumed that spirit and matter can have no intercommunication through action and reaction on one another, contrary to what Locke supposed; and, in order to account for the agreement or correspondence of action in the one with action in the other, he proposed the system of "pre-established harmony," according to which, God, in His omniscience and almighty power, so predetermines, orders, and moves all action both of man's body and soul, that they always occur in perfect agreement or harmony. For example, the action of your eye, by which you see the printed words you are now reading, was preordained to be in perfect agreement with the action of your intellect by which you apprehend what the eye sees; the action of your tongue in speaking intelligible words, is foreordained to be simultaneous with that of your mind in thinking the ideas expressed by those words. In this system, then, which was subsequently developed with still more fullness by Wolff, the soul is the complete principle of all action elicited by its powers, without any concurrent influence received from the body, or from external objects acting on the organs of the body. The body is merely an automaton, and the soul would have its action the same, even if it were not connected or associated with the body at all; and, consequently, Newton could have made his famous induction from the falling apple, and demonstrated his theory of gravitation, just the same, even if we make the supposition that his soul and body were then separated, and actually in different hemispheres.

This theory of "pre-established harmony" surely violates the

precept of sound philosophy, which forbids the introducing of the first cause as immediately producing an effect, which can be satisfactorily accounted for by the agency of second causes.

These three theories are sometimes illustrated by an example, in order that their difference may be more clearly perceived; and the example usually chosen for the purpose, is that of two watches which are made to keep precisely the same time, but in three different manners, or by three different means. First, we may conceive these two watches to be kept in exact agreement by some one near them who advances or retards their respective movements, just as required, in order for them always to indicate the same time. The two watches kept together by such means, represent the theory of occasional causes, as applied to explain the concurrent action of man's soul and body. Secondly, we may suppose these two watches to have been made with such perfection that their movements exactly coincide, and they always mark the same time, because of the entire precision with which their own machinery works. The two watches keeping together in this manner serve to illustrate the theory of "pre-established harmony," according to which God so appoints and regulates all operations, both of man's soul and body, that they themselves always act in perfect agreement or harmony with each other, though one of them has no real influence on the other's action. Thirdly, we may conceive the two watches to have their springs and entire machinery so exactly adjusted or fitted to each other that one acts on the other by contact, and their movements are rendered perfectly harmonious through their real action and reaction, one so hastening or retarding the movements of the other as to make their hands denote the same time. This manner of causing the watches to keep the same time, would exemplify the "theory of physical influence," according to which man's body and soul are so affixed or joined to each other that the action of one really and physically influences the other.

There is a common objection to these three theories for explaining the union between soul and body in man, that seems to be equally conclusive against all, namely, they deny the unity of man's nature as composed of matter and spirit; or, what is the same, they assume that man as a person is made up of two distinct natures that are both complete substances, really existing and acting as such in man. It is plain that no one of these systems admits any substantial union of soul and body constituting man one living substance. But this doctrine contravenes what we positively and certainly know of man as a personal being. We can see in our own conscious and living action that man is one both as a substantial nature and as a person arising from an intimate union of his soul and

body, and not from extrinsic and accidental connection. In accordance with those hypotheses, man, as a person, has only a soul, not a body; his body is an instrument of his soul, but it is not a constituent of his personal being. Against this theorizing stands the fact, however, that man has unity of nature, as a rational animal, and he is one also as a person.<sup>1</sup>

Any one observing and reflecting on what takes place in himself, must see evidently that the action of his body or of its members is his action in a manner wholly distinct from that in which the action of an instrument, which he uses with his hand, or that of an exterior body moved by him, is his action; for example, the action of the hand that feels, holds, and directs the movements of the pen, is totally different from that of the pen itself. The pen in such case is an instrument which is an entirely distinct agent, and which is complete in itself as a substance; the hand, though acting as an instrument in respect to the person, is nevertheless, a living part of that person, in such a manner that its action is really the action of the person, "*actus sunt suppositorum.*" Consequently, the body and the members of the body are not the soul's instruments in the same sense at all that a pen, cane, and the like are instruments; for, the former are real parts of the person; the latter are extrinsic to the person, and have only accidental connection with the person. Also, sensation is not an act of the body alone, nor is it an act of the soul alone, but of both body and soul as constituting one agent.

No one of these illustrious philosophers first began to doubt obvious facts before "his head became intoxicated with a theory," to borrow the language of Stewart. The speculations of him who devises a new and strange hypothesis, are, in many instances, found to start from mere arbitrary assumptions and foregone conclusions, and in order to maintain consistency with them, the theorist is sometimes required to deny or ignore plain and positive facts in fabricating or working out the details of his fanciful system.

There is good reason for saying, and the assertion seems not too bold, that just as the theory taught in the old schools for explaining the origin of our ideas, with some modifications as to certain accidental particulars made by discoveries in the science of optics, is the one which, after all, best accords with obvious and

---

<sup>1</sup> "*Ex anima et corpore constituitur in unoquoque nostrum duplex unitas, naturæ, et personæ.*" St. Thomas, 3 part, question 2, a, 1 and 2. There is constituted of soul and body a twofold unity in each one of us, namely, unity of nature and unity of person. Plato held that the soul is united to the body, as the charioteer to the chariot that he drives; Aristotle rejected this notion, and maintained that man's soul is the formal, life-giving principle of his body, constituting, along with the body, one substance.

well-known facts ; so, the old theory for explaining the nature of material substance or the essential constitution of bodies, with some difference in the application of it, necessitated by discoveries made in the physical sciences, but which do not affect the fundamental principle of the theory, is the one which is most consistent and satisfactory to reason, and is open to the fewest objections of all the theories of matter thus far proposed. But here this desultory article must be brought to a close, leaving further discussion of its perplexed subject among contingencies of the future. Surely the theories coming down to us from antiquity deserve a better hearing than it is now the fashion to give them ; especially as, with all our positive science, we cannot claim to excel the ancients in the art of exact reasoning. A system is not therefore false, because it is an old one ; nor is a theory therefore true, because it is new. We must affirm, from what we see evidently of man's action, that the union of soul and body in him is necessarily that of substantial composition, constituting man one substantial nature, and one person ; and no other species of union between soul and body at all accounts for what we plainly perceive his action to be. The soul is the principle of life and action in the body ; they exist as one substantial nature ; so that action of the living body, or of its members, is not the action either of matter alone, or of spirit alone ; but of the two as constituting one living substance. What theory yet devised explains such a nature, such a union of matter and spirit, in a manner open to so few unanswerable difficulties, as that which makes the soul of man, the "*forma corporis*," the active, living constituent of the human compound, by whose virtue the body itself is existent, so long as the two components remain united ?

---

## THE PRESENT INDUSTRIAL CONDITION OF IRELAND.

*Acta et Decreta Synodi Plenariæ Episcoporum Hiberniæ Habita apud  
Maynutiam, An. MDCCCLXXV. Dublini: Typis Browne et  
Nolan, MDCCCLXXVII.*

*New Ireland*, by A. M. Sullivan, M.P. New York: P. F. Collier, 1878.

*A View of the State of Ireland.* Works of Edmund Spenser. London:  
Henry Washburne, MDCCCLIX.

WE have placed these works at the head of our article, not for the sake of reviewing them, but partly to comply with an established custom, and partly to foreshadow the ground we purpose to go over. Any attempt on our part to sit in judgment on the acts and decrees of the Plenary Synod of Maynooth, would be an unpardonable liberty. It is now rather late to criticize Mr. Sullivan's book; it would be *actum agere*. His book has been duly weighed and praised by some, and found fault with by others. In our humble opinion the title of the book is not just or appropriate. A section of these United States rejoice in being called *New England*; and there is a part of Australia mapped out as New Munster, New Leinster, New Ulster, and New Connaught. But the book is not written for any of these places; it is ostensibly addressed to England and Ireland. The acknowledged exponents of English thought do not betray that any radical change has occurred to authorize a writer to call England new; and we have not read of any new conquests of Ireland. The present generation of its people are directly descended from their predecessors; and if Ireland must be qualified at all, we should expect it to be by the adjective *old* or *young*, or both. Perhaps this is idle criticism. Booksellers are very exacting as to the title of their publications, and authors must generally succumb.

Spenser lived amid the scenes he describes in his *View of the State of Ireland*. Nobody will dispute the ability of the author of "The Faerie Queene;" but he was a prejudiced and deeply interested witness, and we have other and contemporary evidence to rebut his testimony. We may occasionally refer to him in the course of our remarks.

When Spenser wrote, America was just looming above the horizon. On old maps it is pictured as a land of savages and horrid monsters. Had Ireland then been an independent and self-governing country, she might have sent out colonies to its shores and perpetuated not only the race but the language, just as the Spanish, the



French, and the English have done. But the acceptable time had arrived, and the Irish were not able to avail themselves of it. Freebooters, such as Drake and Raleigh, swept the seas. The Irish looked to Spain; it was considered by many the mother country, and it professed the same creed for the maintenance of which they were so sorely afflicted.

During the calamities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Irish sought refuge in France. The *exodus* then really began. Under the pretence that Rome keeps no faith with heretics, which is false, King William and his councillors violated their most solemn engagements. *Hæc mea sunt, veteres migrate coloni*,<sup>1</sup> was the order of the day. Those were the days of "the flight of the wild geese." The Irish fled in thousands to France, and they were received, not with jealousy, but as friends and equals; and the generosity of France has not been unrequited. When has France been in trouble that Ireland has not been deeply moved?

But no people can establish themselves in old countries except by conquest. It is only in a new land it can be fairly done; and the Irish knew that the same power that drove them out would meet them at this side of the ocean, "with bloody hands and hospitable graves." Could they have come then, we would now hear from beyond the sea less about kinships, or more, perhaps, about Irish kinship. It is since the American Revolution, that the Irish could come in considerable numbers to these shores; though there were many who took a prominent part in that struggle, and we read of no Arnold amongst them. They stood by the cradle of the Republic, and they have helped her to a vigorous manhood. The Irish now form part and parcel of the country; they contribute to its progress and share its fortunes. To parody the figure of another: whether the Irish be the feather that adorns the American eagle, is a matter of taste; but strip him of his Irish plumage, though he may not fall flat to the earth, he certainly could not soar with so bold and firm a wing.

We have some misgivings whether the foregoing be germane to the matter indicated by the heading of this article. We hope it is somewhat, so we let it stand. Of late, English writers have appealed to the people of these United States, whom they are pleased to call their kin beyond the sea. They have much to say about the mother country, meaning England; and what they write about Ireland, is not with sympathetic ink; but mostly, "*quicquid Græcia mendax audet in historia*."<sup>2</sup>

These eminent worthies serve as an occasion to remind us that

<sup>1</sup> "This is now my property, ye old occupants must quit."—*Virgil. Eclog. 9* verse, 4.

<sup>2</sup> "Greek historical lies and misrepresentations."—(*Trans.*) *Juvenal*, sat. 10, v. 174.

we are a conglomerate people; and that there is another country, a mother country, *alma virum parens*, which has a numerous kin beyond the sea, who do not feel especially enthused at the recital of the glories of Old England, and who may desire to hear about old Ireland, and how she stands. And this apology brings us to the matter in hands.

It is not our intention to inflict on our readers a repetition of the oft-told tale of Ireland's wrongs; but merely to offer a fair statement of the actual, industrial, and political condition of the country, and note its progress, if any there be. This is no easy task; and when it was first suggested to us, we wrote to a friend in Ireland, who is in every way capable of doing justice to the subject, and whose name—were it known—and position would lend weight to his words. But his modesty prevents him from writing for American readers.

Ireland lies to the northwest of Europe, and between 51° and 55° north latitude; as high up as Labrador, yet it has a better climate than Pennsylvania. This it owes to America. The great current, known as the Gulf Stream, issuing through the gates of Florida, traverses the ocean until it dashes on the Irish coast. There it gives up the heat stored within its bosom. On the wings of the winds it is diffused all over the land, clothing the valleys and mountain sides with perennial verdure; hence, she is styled the Emerald Isle, "the first flower of the earth and the first gem of the sea." All travellers testify to the fertility of the soil and genial climate. We cannot occupy space, which must be reserved for facts and figures farther on, by giving their testimony. Yet we cannot refrain from quoting very briefly from one or two. Arthur Young, who travelled through the country in 1776-78, says of Limerick and Tipperary: "It is the richest soil I ever saw." Another, who wrote in 1812, says, "Ireland may be considered as affording land of excellent quality. . . . Some places (through Meath in particular) exhibit the richest loam I ever saw turned up with a plough." "In the elements of natural fertility," says Mr. McCombie, a Scotch M.P., "only the richer parts of England and very exceptional parts of Scotland approach it." Concerning the soil and climate this must suffice.

Ireland contains over twenty millions of acres; in actual numbers, 20,819,947. Of these, in 1871, there were 10,071,285 acres in pasture, and 5,645,057 under tillage; and the returns of 1876, show that tillage is decreasing. There were 4,153,854 acres of waste, bogs, mountains, and under towns, and 627,761 acres of water. In no civilized country can water be set down as waste; it contributes to the food and convenience of man, and supplies power for manufacturing purposes. Neither should we set the bogs down

as so much surface lost. The Irish peat bogs are estimated at 2,830,000 acres; of these 1,576,000 are flat, and 1,254,000 mountain bogs. Without any enormous outlay, the greater part could be reclaimed and turned into pasture. As to the mountains: there is not very much absolutely barren mountain land in Ireland. We give in proof the instance of the Monastery of Mount Melleray, near Cappaquin, in the county Waterford. About half a century ago the Trappist monks received, as a donation, a large tract of mountain land, which was looked upon as of no value, but by dint of hard and incessant toil they have rendered fertile the barren mountain slope. Where nothing but crag or heather formerly was to be seen, there are now rich meadows and abundant crops. We may safely estimate that of bogs and mountains, three million acres could be made available for pasture or tillage; and that in the whole island there is not much over three million acres of absolutely waste surface.

Here then is a country with a healthy climate, whose mean temperature is 50° Fahr., and with an area of eighteen million acres fit for cultivation; the question arises, what is being done with it? We do not ask whether it increases *pari passu* with other European countries; but, measuring herself by herself, we do ask whether proper use is being made of her great resources. That there has been improvement we freely admit; but whether the improvement be such as we have a right to expect, is a different question. Before we venture an opinion of our own, we give the views of another. H. S. Thompson, late President of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, in his work, *Ireland in 1839 and 1869* says, "A journey of some thousand miles through the various counties of Ireland, has made it impossible for the writer to doubt that in the last thirty years there has been generally throughout the country, a great development of all the elements of national prosperity. Wealth has increased, the condition of the laboring classes has materially improved, and the progress of agriculture, with certain exceptions, has been highly satisfactory." So we must admit an improvement.

We have open before us a huge volume, *Thom's Irish Almanac and Official Directory*, for the year 1878. It contains all manner of items regarding the British Empire, from the latest act passed for the benefit, or otherwise, of Ireland, to the last grandchild born to her Majesty, now happily reigning. It bristles with facts and figures tabulated and classified, and we have only to cull them out as they suit our purpose.

We begin with the railroads. The entire length of the Irish railroads, in 1876, was 2157 miles, and the cost was £16,000 per mile, or a total cost of £34,512,000, about \$169,000,000. Granting

that the greater part of this is not Irish capital, it does not follow that Ireland is greatly enriched thereby. Railroads of themselves are not wealth, though it requires vast sums to build them. They are only means to an end, and if the end be not attained, the money spent is as water poured on sand. The figures before sustain this remark. Of the fifty railroad lines, thirty-five pay no dividend; and of the fifteen that do, some pay only  $2\frac{1}{4}$  per cent., and only one goes over 5 per cent. With us, railroads are the arteries of commercial life. They fell the forest, plough up the prairies, and create cities. But they produce no such result in Ireland. The population of her cities, except Dublin and Belfast, are dwindling away. Before their construction there were good macadamized roads in every direction; and as no part of the country can be over sixty miles from the sea, the people could easily send their produce to a port, thereby giving employment to teamsters and drovers. As a source of wealth, the Irish railroads are a failure. The shareholders are begging the government to take them off their hands. Why they have built so many, we cannot understand. Russia has built extensive railways for military purposes; so has England in India. But we do not suppose that Irish capitalists had any such purpose. Perhaps as other countries were running fast, they thought they should run fast also.

Frequently we find extracts in our papers regarding the Irish banks, but as they are mainly derived from *Thom's Directory*, we use it as authority in our brief remarks on this subject. In matters pertaining to banks we do not pretend to be scientists. However, their general conception cannot be as difficult to unravel as a hieroglyphic on Cleopatra's needle. As far as we are able to judge when in a healthy state, they represent both the wealth of persons retired from business, and the surplus funds of people engaged in the pursuits of active life; if not fully so, yet they do pretty fairly. When a country is prosperous and all goes well, banks are strong; when business is unsettled, banks are uneasy and often fail. Our own country shows this. As far as figures can prove it, the Irish banks indicate a great increase of wealth in the country, and banks do not often fail there. We were tempted to take up a whole form, as the compositor would say, giving the figures of the banks and transfer it to our pages. In 1845, the issue of notes by the six banks of issue in Ireland, was certified and fixed at £6,354,494, being the average amount of notes in circulation and gold and silver coin held by them on the 1st of May of that year. The tables give the amount of circulation during eleven years, from 1865 to 1876. Some years there was a large shrinkage; but in 1876, the notes in circulation was £1,130,000 more than the issue fixed by the act, not including over three millions of coin held by

the banks. Mr. Richmond, United States Consul at Cork, translates the above amounts into \$35,000,000 paper money, and \$14,306,589 coin reserved in the banks. In 1871, the amount of deposits in the joint stock banks was £26,049,000, and in 1877 it was £32,746,000; a considerable increase in six years. The number of depositors in the Trustee Savings Bank, in 1875, was 55,505, and the amount deposited was £2,061,193. In 1876, the number of depositors was 56,849, and the amount £2,178,266, being an increase of £117,073 in one year. But we are informed by authority that the statistics of the Trustee Savings Banks are a very imperfect test of the condition of the classes who deposit in them. They change their deposits, and the same money may thus be counted twice. Canning used to say that nothing lies like figures. In many cases they certainly do not express the truth; and we shall see how far they express the truth concerning the Irish banks.

Before quoting the markets and wages, we copy the number and value of cattle and live stock—the *New Irelanders* that now enjoy so much of the best portion of the land. They are thick as leaves in Vallombrosa. We arrange them as they stand in the order of nature. In the year 1877, by the *Official Directory*, there were in all Ireland:

		Value.
Horses and mules, . . . . .	575,529	£4,458,656
Cows, young and old, . . . . .	3,996,027	51,688,681
Asses, . . . . .	183,787	180,024
Sheep, . . . . .	3,989,178	8,517,874
Pigs, . . . . .	1,467,999	4,167,509
Goats, . . . . .	266,755	87,335
Poultry, . . . . .	13,549,526	291,576

Now, we have no fault to find with these animals if confined to their proper limits; but they should not occupy the place of man. We find by late returns in the newspapers, that horses and cattle are on the increase. Not wishing to make our pages look like a table of logarithms, we omit the tables of the different crops. The sum total value of the cereal (such as wheat, oats), and other crops in 1876, was £35,982,000. The prices of the different crops between 1851 and 1876, have increased for wheat, 20 per cent.; for barley, 45 per cent.; for butter, 70½ per cent.; and for beef, 71 per cent. But if the prices for cattle and crops have increased, so have the rates of labor increased also. Labor is now treble, and in some cases four times as high as it was twenty years ago. These prices, therefore, are by no means a safe test of the growing wealth and prosperity of the country. Our friend in Ireland who knows whereof he writes, says: "I believe the country is little richer " than it had been when we were schoolboys (thirty-four years ago);

“the people are to be sure better fed, and on the whole, better housed and better clothed. The prices for cattle are much higher, and there are more of them. There is also more money in the banks. *But these symptoms are very deceptive.* Very few banks were in the country, formerly, and very few persons lodged their moneys in them. They preferred hiding them in an old stocking or an old bottle at home. If prices have risen on what they have for sale, they have risen still more on what they have to purchase: people want money much more now for their various requirements than of old. When their sons or daughters were of an age to be married, they were able to settle them; but now very commonly they are not. A very large proportion must remain on hands, or emigrate.” But enough on banks and crops and prices. We now turn to another most important topic,—manufactures.

Ireland seems formed for a commercial country. The contemplation of the ocean makes men venturesome, and the Irish have almost loved the sea, as witness the voyages of St. Brendan. Those who have heard or read the speeches of O'Connell, know how he loved to describe its noble estuaries. Tacitus<sup>1</sup> and Ptolemy testify that in their day, vessels from the Mediterranean frequented the Irish ports; and even as late as the stormy reign of Charles I, Bishop Burke, in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, tells us that Galway in commercial importance was next to London. He says, it was not unusual to see thirty or forty large ships enter or clear its harbor in one day. But Cromwell put his curse upon it. He gave that city in payment to his hungry followers, and ordered that no papist should live nearer than ten miles to it. From that time commerce has taken wings from Galway to more favorable resorts; and the other cities and towns did not fare better.

As we do not aim to write an essay on the industries of Ireland, we can treat but briefly of her manufactures and commerce. She has large mineral resources, such as coal, iron, lead, copper, and even the precious metals; but it requires enterprise to call them forth from their hard and reluctant beds. Half the capital invested in the railways could be more usefully employed in developing its mines. Even the greater quantity of the iron and copper that is mined, is shipped to England and Wales in the crude state, instead of being manufactured at home. During some years, iron and copper ore to the value of at least £150,000, have been exported. In 1875, copper ore to the amount of £40,145, was sold in Swansea alone. Ireland is peculiarly adapted to sheep-raising, but it is vain to look for woollen manufactures worthy of the name. We

---

<sup>1</sup> Julii Agric. Vita, cap. 24.

give a few figures from the official register. After the Restoration, the Duke of Ormond, to encourage the woollen trade, established factories in Clonmel and Carrick-on-suir. But the extension of the Irish woollen trade interfered with that of England, and it was put down by Act of Parliament, in 1698. At that time, *recentibus odiis*, England aimed to keep the Irish as hewers of wood and half slaves, and did not like to see them skilled artisans. It was feared that if the helots learned to weave the cap of liberty, they would aspire to wear it. During the twenty years' independence of the Irish Parliament, the woollen trade revived, but it expired again with the Parliament. There were only 1374 persons employed in the woollen factories in the year 1868. The manufacture of *cotton* is equally insignificant. The number of persons employed in it in 1870, was 4157; and of these 1445 were employed in one factory near Waterford, and 683 in a mill near Drogheda. As to the flax and linen trade, it was first introduced by Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, and has grown to be Ireland's national industry. The average flax crop at present is 30,985 tons, and worth over £2,000,000; the number of spindles in 1876, was 920,677, and gave employment to 60,316 persons.

Where manufactures are paralyzed, we need not expect much shipping or commerce. It is well known that the Irish seas abound in various and superior qualities of fish, and if properly worked would be a great source of wealth, and afford remunerative employment to vast numbers. But they are not. The vessels engaged in fishing on the Irish coast are mostly from Scotland, Cornwall and the Isle of Man. Not one-third are Irish, and even they, half of them at least, are only rowing boats. So far from being a source of foreign export, there were over 20,000 barrels of herrings imported in 1876 from Scotland into Ireland: this surely was carrying timber into the wood. Our readers can judge the extent of Irish shipping, when we state that in 1876 there were owned in all the Irish ports, only 1486 sailing vessels, of 165,489 tons, and 222 steamers of 55,135 tons; and there were built only 16 sailing and steam ships of 4121 tons. There were no large vessels on the list; but if they exist, they are *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, for we have failed to discover them. During the same year there were built in Scotland, 292 vessels of 166,214 tons. This certainly is not the riant aspect of New, but rather the grim visage of Old Ireland.

Writers not friendly to Ireland assert that she is now to blame for her own backwardness; as the obstacles that impeded her manufactures have been removed. They forget that habits of national industry are not acquired in a year or a generation. Aristotle says that a man grown to maturity in a cave, when first brought into the light of day would instantly recognize his Creator. He may

have the instincts of natural religion, but he would not be able to make a cotton gin or build the Great Eastern. With us government is, in theory, from the people and by the people; they need not the spur but the rein. Rivers have no charm for their eyes unless floating a steamer; and every waterfall represents power to move machinery. Companies are organized, capital invested, and factories spring up as if by the stroke of the enchanter's wand. Not so in Ireland. Her rivers are not utilized; machinery writes few wrinkles on their brow, and they flow on in their placid course, as they have done from creation's dawn. The government has played the rôle of the paternal, and while introducing "civilities," has brought manufactures into disrepute. Men of a few thousand pounds to spare would not dream of organizing a company and starting a factory. A false standard of worth has been introduced; and a swaggering fox-hunter or briefless lawyer is looked on as more respectable than an intelligent mechanic who may eventually be a prosperous manufacturer. Even were all legal obstructions cleared away, the old spirit remains. Always remember, wrote James II. to Clarendon, his viceroy and brother-in-law, that Ireland is a conquered country, though she was then his only hope. It never was the intention that English and Irish manufactures should be equally fostered; the one must be subordinated to the advancement of the other. The expenditure of the army and navy is £27,286,117, little of which is spent in Ireland. The great dépôts of supply, the arsenals and dockyards, are in England. A fair proportion of these government establishments would stimulate industry. During the short and troubled reign of James II., dockyards were established in Waterford and other ports, and an impetus given to shipbuilding. Were the Irish now to ask for any of these, they would receive in reply a new Coercion Act. The power that so long kept down Irish manufactures is unwilling to lend a hand to help their growth; and the only dependence of the people is on the land. We quote again from the letter of our friend in Ireland: "In the race for wealth through the empire the people here are left behind through the total want of manufactures, except the linen of the North, all depending on the land. It is unable to support all, and owing to the undue competition it is let at prices that leave the poor tenants in many cases scarcely better off than caretakers. Hence, the absolute necessity of some security for the tenant beyond what we have. If we had manufactures, there would not be such undue competition, and things would right themselves." This leads to what mainly induced us to put pen to this paper,—the land question.

Next after religion the land question has been the great question of Ireland, because on it depends the existence of her people.



It began with Henry II.; Elizabeth renewed it; James I. enlarged it; Cromwell smote it with the sword, and Charles II. passed an act for its settlement. It was reopened by William of Orange, and it is not settled yet. It requires heroic treatment, and that need not be expected from an alien Parliament composed chiefly of landlords.

The tenure of land now is very different from what it was in Celtic times. The Irish then held by *tanistry*, and Spenser, who lived in those days and gained 3028 acres of land by its overthrow, tells us what it was. These are his very words: "Their" (viz., the Irish) "ancestors had no estate in any of their lands, seigniories, or hereditaments, longer than during their own lives, as they allege; for all the Irish do hold their land by *tanistry*; which is (say they) no more but a personal estate for his lifetime, that is, *tanist*, by reason that he is admitted thereunto by election of the country." *Tanistry* meant fixity of tenure. The land belonged to the people, and the *Tanist* (prince) could not forfeit or alienate it, as he held only a life interest. The very doctrine of the United States Constitution, which provides that "no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except during the life of the person attainted." *Tanistry* was racy of the soil, and the people were attached to it; but whether it could ever be expanded and adapt itself to a more complex form of life, is now mere speculation. Persons capable of judging say it could. But *Fuimus Troes*; *tanistry* is dead, and another system has long since taken its place.

The origin of feudalism is very uncertain, but its principle is very simple. Feudalism means that the absolute right of all the lands of a country is vested in the king, and the individual holding any portion was only his man or tenant. The theory is, the king can do no wrong, but his tenant can; and as the king can take back what he gave, his tenants' lands are subject to the law of forfeiture. The Irish never took to it. With an instinct almost amounting to logic, they felt it boded them no good. The function of government is to maintain justice; not the *summum jus, summa injuria* of the pagans, but justice such as St. Augustine saw it, the basis and exemplar of human law; and as one form of government may be able to administer justice as well as another, the Irish would ere now be reconciled to feudalism if it brought not only "civilitie," but just laws and prosperity. Under feudalism England grew strong and wealthy, but it was only a blight to Ireland; and we now come to examine into what it has produced there. We quote from the official report, or, as it is called, the *Doomsday Book*. It contains a list of names and figures as tiresome as Homer's catalogue of the heroes who fought before the walls of Troy. The record was not gotten up for party purposes, for we are told, "It is not in-

tended to display individual wealth, or to mark its decline, or by speculative inquiry to promote personal or political objects."

Through the instrumentality of this system every part of Ireland has been forfeited to the crown, and a horde of needy adventurers fastened on the country. Henry II. pretended a title besides his sword, and established his followers in the Pale. The Earl of Desmond was driven into rebellion, and thereby his great principality in Munster, over half a million acres, was confiscated and divided among Elizabeth's favorites. James I. had no difficulty in finding a bill of attainder against O'Neill, and he was thus enabled to bestow all Ulster on his Scotch countrymen. Strafford compelled juries to find the titles of nearly all the estates in Connaught defective, and these lands were forfeited to the king. Cromwell a second time confiscated a great part of Munster; and after the expulsion of James II., vast portions of the land were forfeited again. Thus within the last three hundred years all the land has been forfeited, and parts of it several times. The new owners of the soil had or have little or no sympathy with the people, and lived amongst them almost like any army fortified in an enemy's country. At present, all the land is owned by about 11,000 persons, omitting small holders of no special consequence. Scotland consists mainly of crags and lakes, and one-fourth of it is owned by twenty-four persons; but in England, holders of 100, and under 500 acres are in the largest proportion, that is, they own one-fifth of the land. In Ireland, the same class do not own the one-tenth; so that extensive proprietors hold by far the greatest portion of the soil. What has all this to do with the present state of Ireland? Almost as much as cause with effect. "Spend me, but defend me," was the common saying of the Irish clansman to his *tamist* or chief. His modern lord spends him by rackrents, and defends him by the crow-bar brigade. They are loud about vested rights, forgetting how they acquire them; but they are silent regarding concomitant duties. It is true there has been, since 1870, a Tenants' Compensation Act, or an act to compensate ejected tenants for their improvements; but the landlord is the stronger party in court, and the object of the act is easily defeated. It is practically almost useless. During five years, from 1870 to 1875, the amount awarded to tenants under this act was at the rate of £15,191 per annum;<sup>1</sup> no very great relief, when we learn that the number of tenant agricultural holdings, excluding towns and cities, was 608,864, with a rural population of 4,286,019. Thus nearly the entire population is almost at the mercy of a few thousand

---

<sup>1</sup> The total amount awarded to tenants during five years was £75,595.

landlords; and with what mercy they have used their power we now come to consider.

The census of the population was not regularly taken until recently. There was, indeed, a registry of the secular priests, that they may be readily found should the government require them. The tithe proctor also counted the tenth potato, the tenth sheaf, and the tenth lamb, to garnish the board of the parson; but the official census-man had not yet made his appearance. It is only in 1841 that he was materialized and became an institution. Since then we have reliable figures. The following is the summary, by provinces, of the number of persons in the four last enumerations:

PROVINCES.	POPULATION.				
	1841.	1851.	1861.	1871.	
Leinster.....	1,982,169	1,682,320	1,457,635	1,339,451	
Munster.....	2,404,460	1,865,600	1,513,558	1,393,485	
Ulster.....	2,389,263	2,013,879	1,914,236	1,833,228	
Connaught.....	1,420,705	1,012,479	913,135	846,213	
Total.....	8,196,597	6,574,278	5,798,967	5,412,377	
Decrease, 1841 to 1851.		Decrease, 1851 to 1861.		Decrease, 1861 to 1871.	
Persons.	Rate per cent.	Persons.	Rate per cent.	Persons.	Rate per cent.
299,849	15.13	224,685	13.36	118,184	8.11
538,860	22.41	352,042	18.87	120,073	7.93
375,384	15.71	99,643	4.95	81,008	4.23
408,226	28.73	99,314	9.81	66,922	7.33
1,622,319	19.79	775,714	11.79	386,590	6.67

Between 1841 and 1851 the population decreased about one-fifth—19.79 persons in every 100; from 1851 to 1861, 11.79 per cent.; and from 1861 to 1871, 6.67 per cent. From 1841 to 1871, thirty years, 2,783,623 persons disappeared. During the same period the population of England and Scotland steadily increased. Now Ireland is a very healthy country, as the statistics show. In 1871 the percentage of the sick to the population was only 1.3. When the planets do not move in their regular course, astronomers know there must be some disturbing force; when the population do not increase at the normal rate, there must be a deep cause.

And what that cause is we know full well,—bad laws and bad landlords.

“Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay;  
A bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
When once destroyed can never be supplied.”

The census-takers have divided the dwellings into four classes. The fourth class comprises all mud cabins having only one room; the third consists of a better description, of from two to four windows; the second are good farmhouses, or in town, houses having from five to nine rooms and windows; the first class includes all houses of a better description. The following table shows the house accommodation in 1841, 1851, 1861, and 1871. We give the sum total and omit the provinces.

*Ireland, Number of Inhabited Houses.*

	1841.	1851.	1861.	1871.
First class.....	40,080	50,164	55,416	60,919
Second class.....	264,184	318,758	360,698	387,660
Third class.....	533,297	541,712	489,668	357,126
Fourth class.....	491,278	135,589	89,374	155,675
Total.....	1,328,839	1,046,223	995,156	961,380

*The Number of Families in each class of House Accommodation in 1841, 1851, 1861, 1871 were as under:*

Number of families in...	1841.	1851.	1861.	1871.
First class.....	31,333	39,370	44,302	49,693
Second class.....	241,664	292,280	333,440	357,752
Third class.....	574,386	553,496	553,496	432,774
Fourth class.....	625,356	197,062	197,062	227,379
Total.....	1,472,739	1,204,319	1,128,300	1,067,598

Comparing these figures with the census of the population of the corresponding years, we find that as the people decreased, the accommodations improved, the worst class of houses being five times less in 1861 than it was twenty years before. But between 1861 and 1871 there is again a rapid increase of the worst class of houses.

We have stated that about 11,000 persons own all the land. According to a report submitted to the House of Commons, April

23d, 1872, the annual value for rating purposes was £10,180,434, but its actual value is now about £27,000,000, and of this sum one-third is spent out of the country by absentees. Some say that Ireland has only sentimental grievances. Is this a merely sentimental grievance? Were one-third of England's income spent in Dublin, Killarney, and other noted places in Ireland, would the English like that sentiment? We opine not. They would bellow louder than the bulls of Bashan, and the absentees would hurry home in hot haste.

We have attempted, perhaps with too much circumlocution, to describe the present industrial condition of Ireland. The picture is not a flattering one. "'Tis true, pity 'tis 'tis true." The author of the work second at the head of this article being on the spot must know this better than the present writer, and therefore we are amazed that he dubbed Ireland *New*. She is in the same slough of despond, and we fear will not soon emerge from it.

Were Ireland—which we by no means advocate but suppose—a State of this Union, does any intelligent, candid man imagine she would remain many years as she is? No. Her mines would be worked; her hillsides would be ablaze with the furnace and the foundry; her banks, instead of being the substitute for the old stocking, would receive and give life to industrial enterprise; her fisheries would become a source of wealth and produce a body of hardy seamen; the white sails of her commerce would spread over every sea; the vision of her orators would be partially realized; a new spirit would be abroad and make *new* the face of the land, and millions would hail her *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "O daughter fairer than thy Mother fair."—*Hor. Od. B. 1, v. 17*.

## AN AUTUMN IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

## SEARCHING FOR LEWIS AND CLARKE'S PASS.

**I**N the summer of 1870 I started with two companies of cavalry to post them at Cadotte's Pass in the Rocky Mountains, with a view to prevent certain Indians supposed to be hostile from making use of the pass as a thoroughfare to reach the settlements on the western side of the mountains. On first arriving at Fort Shaw, we were told that Cadotte's Pass was directly behind a conical peak called the "Haystack," plainly visible from the post, and standing directly up Sun River. As this stream was the one down which Captain Lewis and his party travelled in 1807 when on his return from the Pacific coast, I anticipated a good deal of interest in tracing out his route and comparing his description of the country with its appearance at the present day. Hence I carried along a pocket edition of Lewis and Clarke's Expedition, little thinking, however, of what importance it was to prove to me. Captain Lewis must have passed the present site of Fort Shaw on the 10th of July, 1807. On the 22d of the same month, sixty-three years afterwards, we left that point and followed his track back towards the mountains. Although the appearance of the country must have looked about the same, under what different circumstances were the two trips made! Then, this region was a perfectly unknown wilderness, actually swarming with game, for Captain Lewis's journal says:

"We saw a great number of deer, goats, and wolves, and some barking squirrels (prairie dogs), and for the first time caught a distant prospect of two buffaloes. Captain Lewis here shot a large wolf, remarkable for being almost white;" and "about this time the wind, which had before blown on our backs and put the elks on their guard, shifted round, and we shot three of them and a brown bear;" and on the 10th "they (a portion of his party) had been pursued as they came along by a very large bear, on which they were afraid to fire, lest their horses, being unaccustomed to the report of a gun, might take fright and throw them."

On our trip we had no such sport in prospect, and pursued our way up the river, seeing nothing more formidable than a few timid antelopes, one of which I wounded at long range and captured after a sharp chase. We camped after a twenty-eight mile march on Captain Lewis's Shishequaw Creek, now called the Elk or South Fork of Sun River, with settlers' cabins scattered all along it. We had with us an officer who in the early spring had been conducted by one of the guides of the country to what he called Cadotte's

Pass, but I could obtain no information whatever in regard to Lewis and Clarke's Pass, nor indeed did anybody seem to know that there was such a pass in existence. To find this was therefore the first object of our search. Accordingly, the next morning, the main command was started across the country in the direction of what was supposed to be Cadotte's Pass, whilst with a few men I started along the foot-hills to try and discover any trail leading into the mountains. Passing close under the steep rocky sides of the "Hay-stack" (the only name we then knew for it), we pursued our way to the southward over rolling, grassy hills and through beautiful little timbered bottoms, in which we several times caught sight of white-tailed deer skulking, until we reached an opening in the mountains, out of which came quite a large stream, and up which led a plainly-marked trail. This was at once declared by Lieutenant S. to be the Cadotte's Pass to which he had been conducted in the spring; but our guide declared it was not Cadotte's Pass, and we at once proceeded to explore it. The guide was equally positive from the first that we were not on a *lodge-pole* trail, and after we had gone six miles into the mountains, it was patent to all that we were not in any "pass" at all, for the trail became fainter and fainter, and soon after became so overgrown with trees and obstructed with rocks as to render any further progress with horses impracticable. We therefore retraced our steps, and on coming out of the mountains found the main command waiting for us, and we went into camp for the night. Lieutenant S. was positive this was the point he had been brought to for the mouth of Cadotte's Pass, and after searching about amongst the brushwood along the bank of the stream we found the location of the camp they had made, with bits of paper and empty fruit cans lying about. The guide was sent out late in the afternoon to look for any well-marked trail leading towards the mountains, and came back to say he had discovered one, very old, but evidently made by lodge-poles. A lodge-pole trail differs from a simple horse or game trail by the fact that the dragging poles make parallel tracks, which in some places are almost as regular as wagon-wheel ruts.

The next morning we made an early start, and directing the main command to march in a certain direction, I started across the hills to strike the trail discovered by the guide the day before. Within a mile or two, we came to a plain well-worn trail of several ruts running directly south and about parallel to the mountains. Taking from my pocket the copy of Lewis and Clarke, I read:

"July 8th. At three miles from our camp we reached a stream issuing from the mountains to the southwest; . . . we called it Dearborn's River. Half a mile further we observed from a height the Shishequaw Mountain, a high insulated eminence of a conical

form, standing several miles in advance of the eastern range of the Rocky Mountains, and then about eight miles from us and immediately on our road, which was in a northwest direction."

Turning back on this trail, I rode to the top of a high ridge, and there before me, standing out in plain view and bearing in a northwest direction, was "Haystack" Bute, the Shishequaw Mountain of Lewis and Clarke, and we were in all probability upon the very trail used by Captain Lewis's party sixty odd years ago. The question would be definitely settled if in following this trail half a mile back in the other direction we should come to the Dearborn River. Directing the main column how to march so as to strike the river lower down where our wagons could get across, I took a few men and followed back on the trail. We had gone about a mile when we came to a stream answering in every way to the description given of the Dearborn by Captain Lewis, and now the only thing to be decided was as to the pass by which he crossed the main divide of the Rocky Mountains. Following the trail still to the south, we found it after a time turn to the westward and enter the mountains. Our guide was very positive that this was not the trail leading into Cadotte's Pass, and now, with the spirit of exploration strong upon us, we pushed ahead, determined to decide for ourselves where it did lead to. It was very evidently a lodge-pole trail, for as we drew closer to the mountains and entered the timber, the marks of the lodge-poles upon the trees standing close to the trail were plainly to be seen. The trail, however, had been for a long time in disuse, and as the timber got thicker, we found in several places the way obstructed by fallen trees. The ground rose more and more rapidly as we advanced, and after issuing from the dense timber and climbing a very steep hill, we at length stood upon the highest point of the ridge, and had a magnificent view of the surrounding country. Turning to Captain Lewis's journal again, I read under date of July 7th:

"After travelling seven miles we reached the foot of a ridge, which we ascended in a direction north 45° east, through a low gap of easy ascent from the westward, and on descending it, were delighted at discovering that this was the dividing ridge between the waters of the Columbia and those of the Missouri. From this gap Fort Mountain is about twenty miles, in a northeastern direction."

Taking out my compass, I placed it in position, and then looking to the northeast, there stood Fort Mountain (now called Crown Bute, three miles from Fort Shaw), looming up above all the surrounding country, and forming the landmark which Captain Lewis made use of to mark out the pass by which future explorers could determine the point at which he crossed the Rocky Mountains.



The distance, however, from the top of the pass to Fort Mountain is nearer fifty miles than twenty. There could be no question now; we had been following Lewis's trail, and were standing in the very gap where he stood sixty-three years ago, "delighted at discovering" himself once more on the eastern slope of the continent. Not satisfied at reaching the top, we rode on a short distance further and looked down on the other side over that "easy ascent from the westward" to which he refers. We had started in the morning with no idea of travelling so far from camp, but had pushed on, mile after mile, carried away by the desire to solve the interesting problem, and now, late in the afternoon, found ourselves on the very top of the Rocky Mountains, tired and hungry, with horses worn out with the long trip and hard climbing. These we unsaddled and turned loose for an hour, to satisfy as best they could their cravings of hunger on the sparse grass which grew on the mountains, whilst a few mouthfuls of raw bacon, which some of the old soldiers carried in their saddle-pouches, tended to allay our cravings. The "gap" described by Captain Lewis as a "low" one was so only in reference to its surroundings, for although high peaks rose on both sides of it north and south, the gap was high enough to give a very extended view of over a hundred miles to the eastward. At certain seasons, too, it was evidently high enough to be a very breezy place, for the stunted pines which grew there were all lying bent to the eastward very close to the ground, forced to grow that way apparently by the strong western winds which sweep over the mountains.

We had now discovered the existence of a second pass through the mountains not known to the people of the country, for our guide was positive that this was not the one known as Cadotte's Pass, and our next object was to find where that was. From Lewis and Clarke's report we knew of the existence of another, called by the Indians on the western slope, "The road to the Buf-faloes," the trail through which separated from the trail to Lewis and Clarke's Pass, near a place named by Captain Lewis "The Prairie of the Knobs," and the inference was that the trail issued from the mountains to the eastward not very far from the one we were now on. As we came down from the pass therefore, we kept a lookout for any break in the mountains, but our guide could discover no landmarks by which he could locate the pass. After leaving the mountains we had a long ride over a rough country in search of our camp, which we expected to find on the Dearborn River, but when we reached the steep rocky banks of that stream it was nowhere in sight, and, as the sun was rapidly sinking behind the western mountains, we began to contemplate the possibility of having to make a supperless bivouac when we discovered a man

on a distant hill, and travelling towards him soon came in view of the camp nestling in the deep valley alongside the bright stream. Soon after we reached it our guide discovered a large plain trail crossing the river just below, and this being followed towards the mountains the next day was found to lead into what was declared by him to be the "Cadotte" Pass, named after some modern explorer who "discovered" the pass, and gave it a new name, long after it had been discovered and named by somebody else, a very common thing by the way in this Western country, one of the most notorious cases of which is the modern so-called "discovery" of the now celebrated "South Pass."

As the pass we had "discovered" was without doubt the one used by Captain Lewis and named after the two greatest explorers of the age, it became a matter of some interest to decide whether the modern "Cadotte" Pass was or not the other pass spoken of by Lewis, and called from information derived from the Indians, "The Road to the Buffaloes.". To do this, explorations would have to be commenced from the western slope, and the country there compared with the description of it given by Captain Lewis.

Accordingly on the 1st of October, 1871, a party of six set out from the town of Helena, and having been kept up all the night before by a fire which threatened to destroy the town, reached the Hot Springs, three miles distant, with appetites to do justice to a good breakfast, rendered all the more enticing by a bath in the delicious waters of the springs.

These Helena Hot Springs are destined to a great celebrity at some future day. The waters are strongly medicinal, and hot enough when first issuing from the earth to boil an egg, and for bathing purposes have to be first tempered by cold water, which is pumped up from a well close by. You can have a bath of almost any temperature you please, but from 90° to 95° is usually found warm enough, and I know of no greater luxury than a bath in these waters, whether taken in hot or cold weather. The water has been analyzed and found to be essentially the same as that of the Hot Springs of Arkansas. Its use is found to be especially beneficial in rheumatic and neuralgic cases, and some astonishing cures have been effected in these complaints. The water hot from the spring is drank as well as applied externally, and the patient issues from his bath in a delicious glow and gentle perspiration, which I have never experienced from any other water. When taken after great fatigue the effect is to restore the energies in a most remarkable manner. Similar springs are very common throughout this whole region of country, and it seems as if nature had kindly placed close at hand a remedy for the diseases with which she afflicts her children in this climate. The poor miner, toiling

night and day in the cold mountain streams frequently falls a victim to painful rheumatism, and comes to these springs as to a nursing mother, to leave, after a few weeks' bathing, free from his pains and aches.

Lewis and Clarke mention several of these warm springs as existing west of the mountains, and say:

"The principal spring, which the Indians have formed into a bath by stopping the run with stones and pebbles, is of about the same temperature as the warmest bath used at the Hot Springs in Virginia. Captain Lewis could with difficulty remain in it nineteen minutes, and was then affected with a profuse perspiration. The two other springs are much hotter, their temperature being equal to that of the warmest of the Hot Springs in Virginia. Our men, as well as the Indians, amused themselves with going into the bath; the latter, according to the universal custom among them, first entering the hot bath, where they remained as long as they could bear the heat, then plunging into the creek, which was now of an icy coldness, and repeating this operation several times, but always ending with the hot bath."

Another group of such springs, which we shall see in the course of this ramble, is situated a short distance from Deer Lodge. Still another is near Camp Baker, forty or fifty miles east of Helena; a very hot one on the Yellowstone east of Fort Ellis, whilst the National Park is full of them, and all of them possess medicinal properties to a greater or less degree, besides being of immense benefit to persons afflicted with nothing more serious than dirt.

Thus fortified by our visit to the Hot Springs, we commenced to climb the main divide of the Rocky Mountains, over a winding well-graded road, and were soon amongst the clouds and timber of the summit, from which we dipped down on to waters running to the westward, and as the sun was rapidly approaching the snow-capped peaks in the west, we caught sight, far down in the valley below us, of the pretty little town of Deer Lodge. It appeared to be only a mile or two away, but, accustomed as we are to the deceptive distances in this high, rarefied atmosphere, we are not surprised when darkness overtakes us before we draw up at Sam Scott's Hotel.

Our host is a character. He "knows how to keep a hotel," as we readily acknowledge when he seats us at a table supplied with most excellent coffee, *real* cream, elegant tender *elk* steaks, and all the et cetêras which go to make up a good substantial meal. A good comfortable bed ended the day, and the next morning we were to witness our first wonders in the "*Hot Spring Mound*" of Deer Lodge valley.

This valley runs nearly due north and south, is amply supplied with

water, which is (and can be more extensively), used in irrigating its rich bottom lands, which produce the finest grasses and grains. It is surrounded by mountains in the gulches of which rich deposits of gold are found.

The Great Northern Pacific Railroad must go through or across this valley somewhere. Just exactly *where* is at present the all-important question, which is of almost vital importance to every ranche-man in it. A party of railroad engineers are encamped at present in the outskirts of the town, busy on work which is to help decide the matter.

A ride of twenty miles up the valley (south) behind Sam Scott's fast team, through a level country dotted with farmhouses, grain and grass fields, brought us to the Hot Spring Hotel, and a view of the Hot Spring Mound.

Out in the open prairie, which stretches for miles westward till it meets the foot-hills of a range of mountains wooded to their summits, and now partially covered with snow, stands a mound of what is now solid stone, some twenty or thirty feet high, and four or five times that in diameter at the base. Up the side of this we climb, and standing upon its comparatively level top, look around us. In the centre is a nearly circular opening, several feet in diameter, filled nearly to the top with water just warm enough to permit holding the hand in it for a few moments. Around this are several smaller openings, also filled with warm water, as I find to my cost. For, in attempting to play a trick upon one of the party, by pushing him into the larger hole, I stumble into one of the smaller ones and get the worst of the bargain.

We examine this mound with curiosity. It is partially covered with grass and weeds, but in places the solid stone is exposed, and is found to consist of a friable mass of yellowish substance, not unlike petrified wood in texture, and presenting every appearance of having been deposited in ages past from the water as it overflowed at the top and trickled down the sides. In this view of the matter we are confirmed by observing on the plain below what is now taking place.

Apparently this mound has worked its way up to a point beyond which it can go no further, and as the pressure from below forces the heated waters to an outlet, fissures have been formed around the base of the mound where the waters bubble up, in some places so hot that the hand cannot be held for a moment in it. This water, as it rises and overflows, deposits its sediment on the rim of each basin, and smaller mounds are rising around each spring.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The similarity between the formation of this mound and the one in the National Park known as the Cap of Liberty, will be remarked.

But be careful how you step, for the sediment has not yet become hard like that in the principal mound, and unless you keep upon the solid turf formed by the grass, or the boards which have been carefully laid for visitors, you are liable to sink through the soft yellowish soil with the uncomfortably warm water beneath.

A strong smell of sulphur impregnates the cloud of steam which arises from these warm springs, the waters from which are conducted into a tank, and thence in pipes to the bathing-house close by.

All round the mound the low quaking ground, gradually falling away, in some places wet and miry, in others only damp, is covered with a thick, tall growth of coarse sedgy grass, through which a path leads to the mound.

We lingered a long time about this curious freak of nature, testing the heat of the various springs, and were shown one in the very midst of all the warm ones, where the water was found cool enough for palatable drinking-water. Looking at the various smaller mounds, from a few inches to two or three feet high, I could not help speculating as to the vast period it had probably taken to form and solidify the principal mound, judging from the slow process now going forward in the smaller ones. We were shown a spot in the soft yielding ground where some man, mounted on horseback and stimulated probably by that daring spirit of inquiry which "*strong waters*" sometimes give, came very near being engulfed, horse and all, in the treacherous soil beneath. Walking back from the mound and along a path made through the tall coarse grass which surrounded its base, we picked up specimens of grass covered with delicate crystals of the yellowish earth, and reminding one in everything but their color, of the appearance of the foliage on the morning after a sharp frost.

A few yards from the mound stands the hotel, a modest two-story frame building, with a neat, well-carpeted parlor, dining-room, and clean comfortable beds up stairs, which we were invited to inspect. Close by are the bathing-rooms, nicely and comfortably carpeted, and fitted up with all the articles necessary for a splendid bath in hot sulphur-water, right straight from the bowels of the earth. Here you can bathe in, drink, and smell sulphur-water to your heart's content, and if not disposed to be exclusive in your enjoyment (a thing not looked upon with much toleration in this Western country), you can go a few steps farther and enjoy a *dip* in the public bathing-tank, large enough to enable you to exercise yourself at swimming, provided it is not too full of swimmers. The water even here, so far from where it issues from the earth, is so warm that at the first plunge one is reminded forcibly of what must

be the sensation of the poor lobster when man "goes for him" as an article of diet.

Sam drove me home slowly, whilst the rest went at a more rapid pace, for Sam is an inveterate sportsman. I had my gun, and there were ponds he said along the road where ducks were in the habit of resorting about sundown. We found them where he said; three were brought down, and then, after a good deal of hard work with long poles abstracted from a farmer's fence close by, were brought out of the deep miry slough into which they had fallen, and we drove into Deer Lodge long after dark, and too late to keep an appointment we had made to sup in camp with a hospitable engineering party, but not too late to enjoy some of the good cheer set out on a long table in the open air, and afterwards the merry song and witty story around the bright camp-fire, which carried us back to many a similar scene in times not very long passed, when not quite so much boisterous noise was allowed "after taps."

I thought I had seen a wonderful thing in the Hot Spring Mound, and so I did, but the next day was destined to show me a still more wonderful one. I had heard of a Warm Spring Creek, which had a pretty fall, where all sorts of "*petrifications*" were to be found, and near which any quantity of elk, bear, and especially black grouse, were waiting at all times to be shot. I did not care so much about the petrifications. I have shot elk, though never a bear, and as "Mac" of our party says, have never *lost* one, but black grouse is my weakness, and I would travel a good way to find a flock.

The black, blue, dusky, or mountain grouse (for by all of these names it is known), is the most beautiful bird of the country, and moreover, is the most delicious for eating. It is larger than the Eastern pheasant, or partridge, its plumage of a deep slate-blue color, and its flesh as white and delicate as that of a spring chicken, whilst its body is as round and plump as an apple. It frequents only the highest mountain regions, where it lives amongst the pines, and is therefore very little known by sportsmen or others, and seldom seen unless sought for in its haunts. There, if found on the ground and disturbed, it flies at once to the trees, and sitting perfectly motionless, is difficult to distinguish from the bark and foliage of its roosting-place. Gregarious, like most of its kind, when you find one you are apt to find many, and unused as it is to the sound of a gun, the flock will sit still as if asleep on the trees, whilst you shoot down one after another from the boughs above your head.

The morning of the 3d of October was bright and beautiful, and an early hour found me driving down the fine valley of the Deer Lodge, with Sam as my guide, towards the Warm Spring Creek.

Others of the party, preferring their beds, did not rise so early, but were to join us later in the day. Ten miles brought us to the mouth of the Little Blackfoot, where locating our camp, we crossed some rolling hills and reached Mr. P——'s ranche on the Warm Spring Creek. Here, mounting our horses, we rode up a pretty little valley along a fine bold stream, which came tumbling down from the mountains seen ahead, covered to their tops with dense pine timber.

Two miles brought us to the falls, but as on first sight they did not appear to be anything very remarkable, we pushed on above them, rifles in hand ready for the elk or bear, which we expected to make their appearance every moment.

The bottom of the valley was filled with a dense growth of elder, choke-cherry, and service ("Sarvice") berry, which were broken and twisted in every direction by the bears in search of the fruit. But not a berry was to be seen, and the bears having evidently exhausted the supply, had gone to other scenes for food and we saw none, nor did we see any elk. We had now reached as far as we could go with our horses, and had begun to despair of seeing anything to shoot, when with a loud "whir," a flock of grouse rose before the dogs, and took refuge in the trees which covered the steep mountain-sides above us.

Our rifles were at once exchanged for shot-guns, and climbing the steep and rocky ground, we soon were all peering as anxiously amongst the limbs above us, as were the train of teamsters on the oak and pine clad hills of Cerro Gordo when, during the Mexican war, they happened to see the celebrated Herr Alexander stop in his buggy, and, as if unmindful of their presence, pick half a dozen fine oranges from the boughs of an *oak* tree above his head.

But we were more successful in our search for grouse than were the teamsters after oranges, and soon the silent woods re-echoed with the sound of our guns, and bird after bird fell to the ground, the stupid things sitting there all the time to be shot, as if they had no possible interest in the turmoil going on beneath them.

You may call it murder if you will, and so in sportsman's phrase it was, but we were in the condition of the boy who, being in chase of a badger, was asked if he thought he could catch it. His reply was, "Stranger, I am obleeged to catch him; *we are out of meat.*"

We were *out of meat*, but that night our larder was reinforced by nineteen fine, fat, plump grouse.

As the day was drawing to a close we started down the valley again, and reaching the falls, curiosity prompted me to stop and examine them, and richly was I repaid for the delay. I find it difficult to describe the remarkable freak of nature which was presented to us.

Imagine a narrow valley overgrown with tall grass and brushwood, and shut in by high hills, covered from foot to peak with dense pine timber. Suddenly the bottom of this valley rises 30 or 40 feet above itself, the dividing line being a precipice of that height extending all across. This precipice is, however, abrupt only in one place, the centre, where the descent of the main body of water has worn a passage for itself, and at the same time excavated a great cave. On each side of this cave, and extending back to the sides of the valley, the ascent from the lower to the upper level appears to be by successive steps or terraces, all, however, so overgrown with tall grass and brushwood, as to nearly hide the formation at a short distance.

On nearer approach the ground appeared to be quite marshy, and full of water. Stepping, as I thought, upon a soft mossy prominence, I was surprised to find my foot upon a solid rock, though covered with moss and grass, with water trickling through. Another step and then another, and I found myself standing upon a narrow ledge of solid rock, nearly circular in shape, and forming the rim of a basin filled with bright clear water, which trickled over the edge, here and there, where there were depressions. Picking my way carefully along this narrow rim, scarcely wider than the sole of my boot, and in danger every moment of either stepping off into the water to my left, or of falling off into another basin to my right, but on a lower level, I reached a point where the rim of my basin ended in a perpendicular wall, from 18 inches to 2 feet high. Here on a higher level commenced the rim of another basin, upon which stepping, I continued my walk, meeting basin after basin, and rising step by step until I had nearly reached the top. The basins are of all sizes, nearly semicircular in form, most of them filled with water, which was constantly filling the lower ones, through depressions in the rims of those above, and all filled with grass, weeds, water plants, and bushes, soil enough having accumulated in the bottoms of the basin to support, with the plentiful supply of water, the vegetation.

Picking my way partly down the steps again and passing around to the right, I found the terraces there came to an end, and a beautiful green grotto opened itself to my view. The main body of water, after breaking its way through the upright wall and forming the cascade, had, from the accumulation of debris in front, been forced back towards the wall, into the face of which it had worn so as to form a great cave, the top edge of which, at the upper level of the valley, projected far to the front, and was covered with a rank growth of bushes, grass, flowers, and vines of different kinds, the last hanging down over the edge, and the whole surface covered with a layer of deep-green moss.



A portion of the water, distributing itself over the level space above, had found its way to the edge of the cave, percolated through the grass, mosses and vines, and from every pendant leaf, twig, and tendril, trickled a tiny stream, the whole forming as beautiful, wild, and natural a cascade as I ever saw.

Passing across the face of the cave and to the other side of the valley, I found the same terraced formation there, many of the basins, however, being dry, the water having ceased to flow into them, probably where the main body broke its way through the wall.

This remarkable formation was so regular, beautiful, and novel, that the question at once arose, how was it brought about? In looking for the so-called petrifications amongst the masses of rock thrown down by the main waterfall, we found branches of trees, twigs, and leaves incased in a hard covering of rock, in some places as smooth and hard as flint. These then were probably the nuclei on which the substance in the water (probably carbonate of lime) had originally formed, and a beaver dam, formed of twigs and bushes, might possibly have, in the first instance, furnished the basis of the stone one, the upper side being filled in to a level by the washings from the mountains.

But how were the basins formed? They were evidently not washed *out* from the rock, for in that case the rims would have been irregular and broken, instead of being, as we found them, perfectly level and comparatively smooth. The horizontal edge could have been formed only from water in a state of rest. Hence, our conclusion was, that a rill of water, falling against some projection, stick, or nucleus of some kind, commenced to deposit there its sediment. This continued until the formation reached such a height that a little pool of water was formed behind, and then the still water would naturally deposit its solid matter more readily on the edge, where it was slowly flowing over the obstruction it had itself raised, and this went on, little by little, until it finally shut itself in its little basin, and then running over at separate points, it went on building up basin after basin, until the whole structure was formed as we found it.<sup>1</sup>

We gazed long and admiringly at the beautiful scene, which we named "The Terrace Falls," and my fingers fairly itched to go to work, clear away the dead tangled brushwood and rank weeds, which here and there obstruct the view, plant beautiful flowers, water-plants, lilies, etc., stock each bright little basin with gold and silver fishes, and present the whole to Central Park, as a natural

---

<sup>1</sup> This formation is almost identical with that at the Mammoth Hot Spring, in the National Park, which I had not at this time seen.

aquarium from the Rocky Mountains. What a picture it would make there for admiring thousands to gaze at! But here it is born to blush unseen, except by the few adventurous hunters who make their way to this retired spot. But even here we found that some enterprising Yankee had found his way, and speculating, doubtless, what a resort it would be at some future day when this country is filled up with the population it is destined some time to have, had stuck in the forks of a bush by the trail a piece of dirty paper, with this written upon it:

"Tak notis that I have this day settled on this *clame*, which I intend to improve and occupy accordin to law made and provided.

" JAMES BROWN.

" September 17th, 1871."

That *clame*, in this Western country, with the addition of four logs laid crosswise on the ground to indicate the foundation of a ranche, stands good until some other more enterprising man comes along, tears down the "notis," puts up a ranche on the foundation logs and makes it his "home."

The water at the falls is at a pleasant tepid temperature, though a mile above, it is cool and pleasant to the taste, the warmth below being due to a hot spring which flows into it, and probably furnishes the materials out of which the walls of the basins are made. Below the falls the water grows gradually cooler, and as we rode back we could see good-sized trout darting in and out of the thick grass which grew upon the bottom.

On reaching Mr. P.'s ranch, Mrs. P., with true Western hospitality, insisted upon our sitting down to a good dinner she had prepared for us, and whilst we did justice to it she was induced by Sam to give us an account of an adventure she had had with a bear not long before, near the site of Terrace Falls.

It appears that she and her husband, who is a noted hunter in these parts and fond of collecting the young of wild animals, had gone up the creek in search of game. They encountered a bear and her young cub. The old one ran off, and Mr. P. soon succeeded in lassoing the youngster. Then, giving the end of the lasso to his wife, who was on horseback, he went with his rifle in search of the old one. The latter, attracted by the cries of her captured cub, hastened to its relief, escaped the hunter, but reached his wife and prepared to assert her maternal rights. But the impromptu nurse held her ground and the lasso, calling loudly for help, and as Mr. P. rushed back with his rifle, the bear, a large grizzly, beat a hasty retreat into the brush. Knowing how savage these animals are when their young is attacked, we could not restrain our admiration at the valor of the woman, and asked, "How near did the

bear come to you?" "About the length of this room" (twenty feet) was the reply. "How did you keep her off?" "I just said '*Sic, sic,*' when she raised up on her hind legs, and she didn't come any nearer, and then my husband came and she ran away."

Fancy, if you can, such a scene in the midst of the wild Rocky Mountains. A woman on horseback holding a struggling cub by a rope, while its furious mother, indignant at such treatment of her child, and rushing frantically to its rescue, is paralyzed by—what? The utterance by a woman of the first syllable of the proud boast of the mother of States as emblazoned on her escutcheon. This method of arresting a grizzly seemed to possess so many advantages over that pursued by Marcy's naval officer in the early days of California, that we determined to try it the first tight place we got into with one, if for nothing else than to settle the question whether or not the sex of the defendant had anything to do with the matter.

It was long after dark before we reached our camp, where we found the rest of the party snugly ensconced and waiting dinner for us. They listened with interest to our enthusiastic description of the Terraced Falls, and in a grand council afterwards it was decided to "lay over" the next day and pay a second visit to them.

The next morning, early, found us on horseback, and striking across the country in a bee-line for the falls. We went over them again with increased delight, whilst the new visitors joined us in exclamations of wonder and astonishment at the singular formation.

As the hunters of the party were induced to make this second visit as much by the hope of game as by a desire of another view of the falls, they continued their trip up the stream, and just where they found the birds the day before, came across another flock of blue grouse. Bang, bang, went the guns and down came the beautiful birds in quick succession.

The mountain-side was exceedingly steep, and climbing difficult and exhausting in the rarefied atmosphere. Whilst leaning against a tree, panting for breath and almost decided to go no higher, I happened to raise my eyes to the branches above, and there only a few feet from me sat a fine large grouse apparently unconscious of my presence. He soon dropped at my feet and further examination disclosed the presence of another, another, and another, until the trees seemed literally filled with them. I loaded and fired as quickly as a breech-loader permits, and soon had half a dozen or more fluttering at my feet or rolling down the steep mountain-side.

The birds seemed to be sitting as if half asleep, and if so, were probably resting from some migratory flight and dreaming of

other flights and fields of pasture. They appeared to be but little disturbed by the, to them, unusual sound of a gun, and it was some time before the survivors seemed to awaken to the fact that the locality was dangerous, and flew off to more peaceful parts.

By this time, however, I had bagged eleven, which, strung upon the back of one of the horses, gave him the appearance of a non-descript animal, half horse, half bird. "Daniel Boone," one of our party, coming up announced that he also had eleven. Now Daniel is an ambitious hunter, and nothing delights him so much as beating his fellow-huntsmen in the number of his game, especially when any of them happen to stand higher than he does on Uncle Sam's register. It is the only way he has of revenging himself on their higher rank. If he can beat a captain he smiles. Beating a major or lieutenant-colonel is sure to result in a succession of broad grins, with now and then a hearty laugh. But to beat a colonel is his highest ambition, and the announcement of his victory is sure to be followed by a series of yells worthy of wild Indians in their hour of triumph and glory. Knowing his weakness we set a little trap for him, into which he fell with charming simplicity.

During the rest of the hunt we separated, and it so happened that an orderly, who carried a bag containing all of Daniel's birds, accompanied me. After this I got but a single bird, which I placed in *his* bag and said nothing. He also had killed another.

On reaching camp we all assembled to witness the counting of the game. Daniel's bag was opened first, and one by one he counted out his birds until he came to the twelfth, when, seeing there was still another, he jumped to his feet and commenced uttering his yells of triumph. In vain I protested there was some mistake. He would listen to nothing, and we could hear nothing but his wild and victorious yells. At length, when he had nearly exhausted himself, I called for the man who had *his* bag.

Daniel interrupted himself in the midst of a yell as I asked the question,

"Smith, did not I kill a bird upon the side of the mountain?"

"Yes, sir."

"What did you do with it?"

And Daniel's face fell to twice its length, and he muttered to himself "sold" when the answer came.

"I put it in *Mr. Boone's* bag."

As the whole party had been summoned to witness Daniel's discomfiture, it was a long time before he heard the last of the joke, and frequent references were made, during the trip, to his ambition as a sportsman and his skill with the gun.

Our camp is near the site of one of the winter cantonments of

Mullan's wagon-road party, exploring a road from Fort Benton, on the Missouri River, to Walla Walla, on the Columbia, and our route the next day led up the Little Blackfoot on that road to Blackfoot City, where, instead of crossing through Mullan's Pass, we turned northward, and crossing a very rough rocky country, covered in every direction with masses of timber, struck Captain Lewis's route near Lincoln Gulch, on the Big Blackfoot, undoubtedly the stream referred to by Captain Lewis as the one called by the Indians the Cokalahishkit, or the "*River of the road to the buffaloes.*" After a visit to the somewhat dilapidated mining camp of Lincoln Gulch, we followed up this stream and encamped, in a dismal drizzling rain, just where the stream came out of the mountains. Beyond this we could not take our wheels into the mountains, and during the evening prepared to continue the trip with pack-mules, sending our vehicles around by the road, to cross the mountains and meet us at the Dearborn River on the other side.

The morning of the 8th of October opened upon us in a sufficiently discouraging way. The ground was covered with a heavy fall of snow, and it was still coming down in a way which bid fair to make our trip across the summit a disagreeable one, even if it did not put an end to it altogether. But it was no time for hesitation, for if the storm should prove a severe one we might be detained here a week, snowed in in the mountains. Preparations were therefore at once made for our departure, and in the midst of the heavily falling snow we bade good-by to our wagons, and with horses and pack-mules started up the trail towards the mountains. Being now on the route of Captain Lewis, every foot of the way is of especial interest, and the journal is consulted at every step. We look around us in the "Prairies of the Knobs," so named by him "from the multitudes of knobs irregularly scattered through this country," but look in vain for the quantities of game which he reports as existing there. "We saw," he says, "goats, deer, great numbers of the burrowing squirrels, some curlew, bee-martins, woodpeckers, plover, robins, doves, ravens, hawks, ducks, a variety of sparrows, and yesterday (July 5th) observed swans on Werner's Creek." Now we see none of these, and perhaps no fact speaks more plainly of the advance made in the settlement of the country, than that a region which sixty-five years ago was teeming with game of all kinds is now a solitary wilderness. Not a living thing except ourselves is to be seen, and as we move along through the white waste, we brush from the heavily loaded limbs overhanging the long-unused trail the masses of snow which have accumulated there. There is very little wind, but the silently falling snow is very wet, and as it grows colder we begin to feel wet, chilly, and disagreeable, and finally halt to build a fire, around which

we all gather for warmth. When we resume the march, however, and commence to climb the long steep hill which leads to the summit, having previously left Lewis's trail and kept to the right on that of "the road to the buffaloes," we begin to feel the wind, which was sweeping as usual fiercely over the tops of the mountains. When at length we reached the summit, it was to find the trail totally obliterated by the deep snow, which was piled up in drifts by the heavy winds. We were in the midst of a howling storm, on the top of the Rocky Mountains, with no guide who knew anything of the features of the country, and no way to get out of it but by following a trail we could not see, except here and there where the snow was blown off of it. Our horses would not face the fierce gale and blinding clouds of snow, and we hunted for some time before discovering where the trail led down the mountain. When we at length found it, however, the marks upon the trees aided us in following it in spite of the snow, and being now protected by both the timber and the mountains from the storm we made very good progress, until we formed our bivouac high up on the eastern slope, with the design of having a hunt in the morning. Our camp was but a sorry one in the midst of the wet snow, and we had no shelter but a wagon-sheet pitched as a tent; but we put it up in a little grove of timber, and a roaring fire soon gave us all the comfort we could reasonably expect under the circumstances, and we slept the sleep of tired travellers. The next morning the storm had considerably abated, and with our rifles we started out early in search of game. But we soon became aware that the hunting days of Lewis and Clarke were past, for after climbing over miles of the rough mountain spurs without seeing so much as a single deer, we returned to camp, packed up and resumed our trip eastward down the mountains. Our guide, as we issued from the foot-hills, announced that this was the modern Cadotte's Pass, and as we got farther away from the mountains, the landmarks around the entrance of Lewis and Clark's Pass, explored in the preceding summer, were distinctly recognized at about three miles to the north of us; so that we had demonstrated not only the existence of *two* passes close together, but that they were the two described by Lewis, and named by him "Lewis and Clarke's Pass," and "the Road to the Buffaloes." We had a rough tedious ride after leaving the mountains, and it was long after dark before we reached a ranche, on the banks of the Dearborn River, where our vehicles were to meet us. Our pack-mules got separated from us in the darkness, and we were very glad to accept the hospitality of the ranche-man, eat his food and sleep on the floor in front of his blazing fire. The next morning our packs rejoined us, our wagons and buggies made their appearance, and jumping into the latter we in

a few hours drove rapidly over the thirty miles which separated us from Fort Shaw.

Passing from one side of the Rocky Mountains to the other, nothing strikes the traveller more forcibly than the contrast between the scenery on the two sides. On the east, after you leave the mountains, there is a total absence of timber, except close alongside the few streams which water the country, and the high rolling prairie-lands commence to assume those features characteristic of the "prairie country" west of the Missouri River. From the top of the *divide*, the country looks anything but like a prairie, for it is *broken up* and *washed out* into an infinite variety of hills and dales, bluffs and bottom lands, and these appear to spread out before you as you advance, into an almost endless succession. But as you overlook the country and notice the prominent points in it, you will observe that whilst some of these have evidently been projected *up* from the general surface, like "Bird Tail Rock" and the adjacent peaks, others bear such a relation to each other, that there can be no doubt they have been left standing after all the rest of the country has been *washed out*. Cast your eye along the tops of the prominent peaks in front of you, and observe how nearly the formation and general level agree with each other, and if, in your *mind's eye*, you can manage to shut out the intervening valleys, you cannot fail to trace the general outline of that vast slope, which, before the deluge of water came to wash out its valleys, stretched eastward from the mountains like the great glacia of a fort. When you descend into this region too, you will note in detail the action of the water which in times past has swept over this country with a force which only the hardest and most enduring of rocks could resist. Standing upon the parade-ground at Fort Shaw, situated in one of these washed-out valleys, you can trace in profile on the opposite side of the river the long slope, extending from the snow mountains in the west, and gradually declining out of sight to the eastward, whilst if you examine the ground under your feet, where it is exposed on the bank of the river, you will find that, low down, it is composed of large rounded boulders, which become smaller and smaller as you approach the surface, until near the surface you find nothing but pebbles and gravel surrounded by loose soil. Now, if you turn your eyes to the southward, you will notice a line of rugged bluffs, which mark the continuation of the long slope on the other side of the river, and turning still farther to the south, the top of Crown Butte (Lewis and Clarke's Fort Mountain), is seen to continue the marking of the general surface in that direction. Ascend these bluffs anywhere, and when you reach the top you will see that the general surface of all is the same, and that the heights are merely the remnants of

a former level left standing. The work of demolition is still going on, but now very slowly, for the steep ledge of hard granite near the top, is succeeded by a long slope of disintegrated rock extending to the valley below. This is yearly increased, but the rains of spring and frosts of winter work more gradually than the heavy deluges of water, which in former times swept torrent-like across the face of the country.

Turning now to the western slope, we find an entirely different state of affairs existing. There, instead of the total absence of timber, as on the eastern slope, the whole broken surface of the country is covered with a dense growth of timber, mostly pine. This probably is accounted for by the fact that the western winds, laden with moisture from the Pacific Ocean, are deprived of most of it as they pass over the high mountain ranges intervening, and after crossing the main divide, they sweep over the slope to the eastward as the dry winds so characteristic of this region. Trees will grow on the eastern slope, if only they are supplied with the requisite moisture, as has already been satisfactorily demonstrated. This is the case not only with trees, but with all sorts of grasses, all the small grains, and most of the common vegetables, and the so-called "bench lands" of the territory are destined to play an important part hereafter in agricultural products. Indian corn does not grow well, the nights are too cold, and in only a few favored localities will it mature. But the product of small grains is astonishingly large, and the flour produced from the wheat grown here makes the sweetest bread I ever tasted, although not so white as that made with Eastern flour. Vegetables, more especially roots, grow to a remarkable size, and even in soil strongly impregnated with alkali, the finest specimens of beets, turnips, carrots, etc., are produced.

These "bench lands" form a distinguishing feature of the landscape in this country, especially in the mountain valleys, where several of them are frequently found rising one above the other, forming well-marked terraces. I have often speculated as to the manner in which they were originally formed, and was much interested lately in an account of a lecture delivered by Prof. Tyndall descriptive of the so-called "parallel roads of Glen Roy," in Scotland, the description of which agrees perfectly with that of the "bench" lands of this region, except that the former are much narrower, varying from one to twenty yards. They are described as "three perfectly horizontal and parallel roads, directly opposite on each side, those on one side corresponding exactly in elevation to those on the other." It is somewhat remarkable that their perfectly horizontal position should not at once have suggested water in a state of rest as the cause of their origin, but with the charac-



teristic tendency of the popular mind to assign *any but a natural cause* for such formations, they were at first supposed "to have been made for the heroes whose deeds have been sung by Ossian," and then that "they were designed for the chase, and were made after the spots were cleared in lines from wood, in order to tempt the animals in the open paths after they were roused, in order that they might come within reach of the bowmen, who might conceal themselves in the woods above and below!" The next supposition was that they were made for irrigating purposes, but any one who reflects upon the nature of water to seek its own level, and that irrigating ditches must have a certain inclination, would find this supposition incompatible with the horizontal position of the "roads." It remained for science, in the person of Dr. MacCulloch, to suggest that these "roads" were the borders of ancient lakes, whose waters were in some way held for a long time at the several levels, to enable the washings from the surrounding hills to form the level benches in the edges of the still water. The facts in the case were afterwards brought forward by Sir Thomas Dick Lander, whose explanation could not yet be accepted for the want of a demonstration regarding the barriers necessary to hold the waters at those levels, the action of ancient glaciers not then being understood, and it remained for the great Agassiz, who had studied glacier action in his native Switzerland, to discover the marks of such action in Great Britain, and to pronounce, after a visit to Glen Roy, that the barriers which had obstructed the glens were glaciers. This ascription of glacier action attracted the attention of Prof. Tyndall, who made a visit to the Glen, in 1867, and was so perfectly satisfied with the evidences of the action of ice and water, that he says: "The theory which ascribes the parallel roads to lakes dammed by barriers of ice has, in my opinion, an amount of probability on its side which amounts to a practical demonstration of its truth."

There can, I think, be no question that the "bench" lands of this region are the result of similar action, and it only remains for science to demonstrate the existence of the remains of glaciers, some traces of which have already been observed at the outlets of the valleys, to render the demonstration perfectly conclusive.

---

## WAS SHAKESPEARE A CATHOLIC?

THE subject we propose to reopen in the following pages has an interest peculiarly its own. Removed, properly, from the heats of theological controversy, it is nevertheless not a subject of mere literary curiosity. If the inner life of great men, the prevailing and guiding motives of their actions, and all which gives significance to their history, are of more interest than their bare biographies, it cannot but interest us deeply to inquire what was the religious belief of a genius without a rival in any age or in any country. A Catholic critic, at all events, can pursue this investigation without the slightest theological bias. What can it matter to the Church whether or not Shakespeare was a Catholic? She sets as much store by the soul of the poorest and most uninstructed as by that of a Newton, a Bacon, or even a Shakespeare. It would not in the smallest degree impair her supernatural nature, nor her right to claim faith and obedience, if not one man of intellectual greatness had ever bowed his mind to her sweet yoke. But notwithstanding this, who is there of us who can affect unconcern as to the religious convictions of a man in whose company we have spent, and may still spend, so many delightful hours; who fascinates us, now by the playfulness of a satire that never wounds, now by the depth and truth of his intuitions, the sublimity of his imagination, and his vast range of thought; who, by the exhaustless energy of his creative fancy, conjures into our presence a multitude of men and women whom he himself has made, who have a place in our memory, who become the objects of our detestation or of our love, of our scorn or our admiration, in short, of every sympathy, emotion, and passion, as really and completely as if we had taken them by the hand, sat by them, spent hours with them, and heard them speak and converse; who, by the witchery of words which lends its own voice to every nicest shade of human folly or human greatness, of human baseness or of human virtue, keeps our minds rapt in suspense over the histories of the creatures of his genius, the crises of their destinies, and the inevitable catastrophe, be it ludicrous or tragic, engendered by their foibles or their crimes. And, as if this were not enough, by a yet mightier spell he carries us on the wings of fancy beyond the limits of the known creation into imaginary spheres of existence, whose denizens are presented to us in no fantastic attributes of improbability, but in forms so true and real that we feel almost as if we had known them before, and accept them without question. And yet more; in every catastrophe, and here and there throughout every history, there issue great

moral truths, like springs of transparent water in a leafy woodland carpeted with flowers, by which the ways of God are justified and man ennobled. We could be as easily indifferent as to the faith of a beloved friend as to that of Shakespeare.

We of these days of cheap newspapers and shameless interviewing can scarcely understand the utter dearth of materials from which some information may be gleaned of the private life and habits of so eminent a personage as Shakespeare; one, too, who seems to have been so beloved by his acquaintance and friends. Of those trifling incidents, familiar customs, and ordinary habits of daily life which reveal to us the inner self and real character of a man more clearly than more impressive incidents, and than his studied bearing under general observation, we know literally nothing. If we would know him we must find him in his writings. To them, too, we must have recourse, from lack of any positive information on the subject, if we would find out what was his religious belief. There are one or two facts which must be constantly had in view if so interesting an inquiry is to have any practical value.

Obviously, we cannot afford to lose sight, even for a moment, of the state of things, first, in Christendom generally, and then in particular in the country whose privilege it is to have produced our poet.

At his birth an era of faith and religious peace had closed, to be succeeded by an era of revolutions. The cradle of Shakespeare may be said to have been rocked in revolution.

The position of England with reference to Protestantism was unlike that of any other nation or people who embraced the new tenets. It is true that their adoption by whatever state resulted more from some political exigency than from religious belief, although no doubt there was mingled with this not a little of sincere but passionate and unreasoning conviction. The latter would never have prevailed without the assistance of the former. It was not the kind of spirit which could afford to dispense with the arm of the flesh. Sooner or later, however, all the populations of the kingdoms over whom the Evil Spirit prevailed acquiesced in the newfangled views of Christianity, as the multitude ever will in teachings which flatter their lower nature. And so, indeed, they did in England at last, but under circumstances which there is no necessity of recapitulating here. In Shakespeare's time there was no such acquiescence on the part of the English people. The man who tore England from the Holy See was, it is true, in insubordination, self-assertion, and intense personal pride, Protestant to the heart's core. In the dogmas of the Catholic faith, however, he was a firm believer. He had written, and ably, in their defence,

and had impaled the arch-heretic on the point of a not feeble pen. Woe to him who maintained the Protestant heresy to his face! It would have been, "Off with his head!" Even his poor creature, Cranmer, whom he thrust into the chair of St. Thomas, who canted and recanted and canted again, was compelled to conform to every dogma of the Catholic faith except the one which stood in the way of his master's lascivious and despotic will.

It happened, thus, that the separation of England from the Catholic Church was a separation not so much of doctrine or liturgical form as of jurisdiction. The doctrine and liturgical changes effected by the boy king, Edward VI., were immediately obliterated by his successor, the pious and gentle Mary. The profession of Protestantism by her successor, Elizabeth, in whose reign Shakespeare flourished, was forced upon her by the peculiarity of her position. What faith she had was undoubtedly Catholic. It can be safely affirmed that the English people, up to the time when their bastard Queen, laden with temporal glory but reft of hope, with a burdened conscience, and trying to assuage her despair by the mummeries of a grovelling sorcery, breathed her last, had not acquiesced in the new versions of Christianity which had beguiled so many of the nations.

There was, thus, in England an absence of the passionate sectarianism, or rather bitter animosity against the Church, which characterized the revolt from her gentle yoke in other countries. Neither can we distinguish any very obvious traces of political animosity. The sovereign power, which had culminated in despotism in the hands of Henry VIII., was too strong to admit of antagonism or of political partisanship. Discontent there was, but no one who wished to keep his head on his shoulders ventured to give expression to it. A passive acquiescence, even, in the criminal excesses of sovereign power was not enough. An avowed consent was often demanded, especially of those whose exalted rank and nobility of character made them objects of suspicion. Not all the virtues that adorn humanity were able to save the head of Sir Thomas More from the block. To remain in the communion of the Church was to pronounce the King an adulterer, and in that way lay martyrdom. In this respect matters were not improved under Elizabeth. In one aspect they were worse. The peculiarity of her position gave more place to the passionate heats of sectarianism. Her father had no competitor for his throne, and was too resolute and too powerful to need the alliance of any faction or party.

Elizabeth was compelled by the stress of events to profess Protestantism and to invoke its aid. Not that the Church would necessarily have deposed her on account of her birth. Illegitimacy of

birth does not necessarily incapacitate a sovereign from reigning. No doubt the Church would never concede her support to the claims of a usurper against those of the rightful heir without flagrant cause. In this case the rightful heir was a pious Catholic, and the usurper an avowed heretic and schismatic. The mortifying position of the latter, who, there is every reason to believe, held in supreme contempt the religionists into whose arms she was thrown, was rendered more intolerable to a vain and imperious woman by the circumstance that her rival excelled her as much in beauty, and in all womanly goodness and graces, as she did in the justice of her claim. And so it came to pass, by the inexorable logic of events, that for an English Catholic to profess the faith by which he hoped to be saved was tantamount to pronouncing his sovereign a usurper, and, after the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, a mean, jealous, and cruel murderess.

It is easy now to see how it happened that, during the first sixty or seventy years of the inauguration of Protestantism in England, we find so few traces of that fanatical sectarianism and bitter hatred of St. Peter's See which marked its rise and progress amongst all other apostatizing peoples, but in which England afterward enjoyed the unenviable distinction of surpassing them all. But that was a subsequent importation. It came in with Scotch James, caused a revolution, a regicide, after a restoration another revolution, and a whole subsequent history of religious discord, broils and persecutions—a dismal heritage, of whose vulgar horrors England is not quite rid even to the day in which we write. And we may without irreverence regard it as a judgment of God upon that nation for robbing Scotland of her faith, and for the infamous means she employed in order to effect her unholy purpose.

In this state of things it is probable that any English Catholic whose rank and influence did not provoke attention was able, throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth, to retain his faith and practice the essentials of his religion so long as he did not impugn the Queen's title nor show himself disaffected to the existing order of things. At the same time, for the reasons already given, it is clear that the very fact of professing the Catholic religion unavoidably placed the believer more or less in an attitude of passive opposition, as it were, to the reigning sovereign, and it was necessary for him to practice his religion with as little ostentation as possible, if not, indeed, to conceal it.

Notwithstanding all this, it is remarkable that there is no contemporary testimony upon the strength of which we can assert that Shakespeare was a Catholic; and we are driven to search his writings for inferential evidence whether he was or was not. Nevertheless, this very silence on the subject, on the part of his contem-

poraries, seems to favor the belief that he clung to the faith of his ancestors. If he had been an adherent of the new religious views, we should have been sure to have heard of it, and pretty loudly too.

Our business, however, is with the internal evidence afforded by his writings; and, bearing in mind the condition of affairs just described in England during the time when he wrote, we think we shall be able to satisfy every impartial reader, that from them we may gather very strong evidence indeed that he was not of those who sold their faith for a mess of pottage.

In searching among the dramas of Shakespeare, in order to ascertain the religious convictions of their author, it would argue great shallowness, nay frivolity, of criticism to found any conclusions on opinions, sentiments, or expressions, which fall from the lips of the characters he portrays. Every one of those must speak and act in the truth of the character with which he is invested by the magic pen that called him or her into being. Our opinion must be gathered rather from the characters themselves with which he invests his personages, from the incidents he invents, the truths he inculcates, and whatever obviously expresses himself. Having once created his *dramatis personæ*, they are, so to speak, out of his power. They must be true to themselves; but of what sort they shall be, he is the supreme arbiter.

The political exigencies of Elizabeth had already made an opening for the Puritans. Already they had sufficient influence to afflict the playwrights. The Swan of Avon was a very black swan, indeed, in their eyes, and they forced him to wing his flight across the river and settle with his play-troupe in Southwark. Had Shakespeare belonged to this class of religionists, there would not have been the slightest uncertainty as to his religious views. Every one of his Catholic characters would have been a Caliban, an Iago, a Richard III., a Goneril, or Lady Macbeth; at the best a Falstaff. All his Protestant characters would have been miracles of virtue, and favored vessels of election.

But we may go further than this. If the poet had conscientiously shared the religious profession of the reigning powers, which was a very modified form of Protestantism, it is almost certain that such of his *dramatis personæ* as were of the new English religion would have been invested with characters which would compare on the whole advantageously with the characters of those whom he portrayed in communion with the Holy See. There was everything to induce him to adopt such a course. Proprietor of a theatre, for which he wrote the dramas to be represented, it would have promoted his moneyed interests, and also indeed his literary fame, which was, at the time, involved with them. Court patronage was wealth and fame to him. Court opposition, ruin. Under

such circumstances, had his religious convictions been sincerely antagonistic to those of Rome, he could scarcely have helped portraying his characters of the respective religions in a manner conformable to his own belief, his own interest, and the belief of those in power. It would have been unnatural not to have done so. In his portrayals of the clergy of the respective religions, and especially of the Religious—those *bêtes-noirs* of the Protestants—this bias would have been especially marked. Even if he had so far subserved his own obvious advantage as to create bad priests and bad Religious, it would not have proved that he was not a Catholic. Unfortunately, there have always been a few of that class; and then, perhaps, more than now. It is quite remarkable how exactly contrary is the whole bias of Shakespeare's dramas. No one can read them through attentively without being convinced that the sympathies of the poet were with the Roman Catholic Church.

There are but two passages throughout them which militate against this conviction; one is the celebrated reply of King John to the Cardinal Legate Pandulph.

“ What earthly name to interrogatories  
Can task the free breath of a sacred king?  
Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name  
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous,  
To charge me to an answer, as the Pope.  
Tell him this tale; and, from the mouth of England,  
Add thus much more,—That no Italian priest  
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions;  
But as we are under heaven supreme head,  
So, under him, that great supremacy,  
Where we do reign, we will alone uphold,  
Without the assistance of a mortal hand;  
So tell the Pope; all reverence set apart,  
To him, and his usurped authority.”

The other is the prediction of the glory and virtue of Elizabeth put into the mouth of Cranmer.

If all the dramas of Shakespeare were pervaded by a spirit of hatred, or only of antagonism to the Catholic Church, these two passages would no doubt add their testimony to the rest. But inasmuch as all his plays are characterized by a directly opposite spirit, they scarcely afford reason for concluding him to have been an apostate from the religion of his country and his forefathers.

As to the first, whatever intimation it conveys on the subject is the other way. In King John, the poet, borrowing his colors from history, has placed before us, with all the power of his genius, an unscrupulous tyrant, ready for any crime in the prosecution of his ambitious designs, not altogether devoid of the physical bravery

for which his family was distinguished, but made, at times, a coward by his conscience, ready to trample alike on the rights of his subjects and on the rights of the Church, and equally ready, at any moment, with the vacillation of guilt, to retreat from his usurpations when the success of his cause could not be secured without. The man was at once a usurper and a murderer. He ventured to oppose the Church, but he was not a Henry VIII., nor did he live in the sixteenth century. Instead of rending his kingdom from the Church, the Church extorted from his unwilling hands a charter which secured forever the liberties of his subjects. When the poet places in the mouth of such a man the insult to the Pope we have quoted, he makes him speak as such a man would have spoken; but a more unreasonable conclusion could not be drawn than that the poet would wish it to be supposed that he himself thought in common with him.

It must be confessed, however, that the following prediction, which he fathers upon Cranmer, is not one which, at the first blush, we should have expected to have been written by a Catholic:

“ This royal infant (heaven still moves about her!)  
Though in her cradle, yet now promises  
Upon this land a thousand, thousand blessings,  
Which time shall bring to ripeness: she shall be  
(But few now living can behold that goodness)  
A pattern to all princes living with her,  
And all that shall succeed: Sheba was never  
More covetous of wisdom, and fair virtue,  
Than this pure soul shall be: all princely graces  
That mould up such a mighty piece as this is,  
With all the virtues that attend the good,  
Shall still be doubled on her: truth shall nurse her,  
Holy and heavenly thoughts still counsel her:  
She shall be lov'd and fear'd: Her own shall bless her;  
Her foes shake like a field of beaten corn,  
And hang their heads with sorrow: Good grows with her:  
In her days every man shall eat in safety,  
Under his own vine, what he plants; and sing  
The merry songs of peace to all his neighbors:  
God shall be truly known; and those about her  
From her shall read the perfect ways of honor,  
And by those claim their greatness not by blood.  
She shall be to the happiness of England,  
An aged princess; many days shall see her,  
And yet no day without a deed to crown it.  
Would I had known no more! but she must die,  
She must; the saints must have her; yet a virgin,  
A most unspotted lily shall she pass  
To the ground, and all the world shall mourn her.”

An investigation, such as that which now engages us, would be valueless if it showed any sign of bias or partiality. We are dis-



posed, therefore, to ascribe rather more than less than its due weight to the testimony offered by this passage of the alienation of its writer from the Catholic faith. The wholesale flattery of the Protestant Elizabeth has no special significance on this score. The most illustrious of the poets have been the most obsequious flatterers of princes, and Shakespeare had every possible inducement to practice this poetical imposture. But there is, at all events, one expression in this complimentary prediction, which, taken by itself, and if it be supposed to convey the sentiments of the writer, would look ugly for the theory of his having been a Catholic. We refer to the prediction, "God shall be truly known." This is obviously the sentiment of a man who sympathizes with the *fautors* of the new religion. It implies that there had not been as true a knowledge of God before her reign as there then would be. It is obvious that the whole value of such a passage as this, coupled with the gross flattery of the Protestant usurper, in the midst of which it occurs, as an indication of the writer's religious belief, depends upon whether or not it is in keeping with the general spirit and tendency of his writings. Nothing is more certain, as we have before stated, and as we shall presently endeavor to prove, than that this is not the case.

But are we obliged to suppose that, in the passage in question, the poet was giving expression to his own sentiments? Were there nothing to lead us to suppose the contrary, that undoubtedly might be a fair conclusion. When a poet throws a flattery of his sovereign into the form of antedated dramatic prediction, it is fair to conclude that he would select those subjects of praise which he himself thought redounded most to his or her glory. This it was impossible for Shakespeare to do if he were a Catholic. He must have insulted rather than flattered her. His way out of the difficulty was obvious. He lays the responsibility on one of his *dramatis personæ*. He takes the mitred tool of Henry VIII., more weak, it may be, than wicked, and makes his servile lips chant Protestant pæans in honor of Henry's illegitimate daughter. Cranmer could not have spoken otherwise. It is what we should have expected from the timid parasite of power. We must go further if we would discover any trustworthy evidence of the religion of Shakespeare.

This very play of "Henry VIII.," in all its structure, bearing and characters, and in the general spirit which pervades it, is able to throw not a little light on the subject. Not a play written by Shakespeare was so likely as it to betray antagonism to Rome, and Anglican proclivities, if he had any. Its leading incidents are marked out for him by all but contemporary history. The reigning sovereign, whose birth constitutes the catastrophe, so to speak,

whom he had every motive to propitiate, and whom it would have been fatal to offend, was the offspring of a cohabitation which Rome had pronounced adulterous. That sentence branded her with illegitimacy, and invalidated her claim to the throne. The rightful heir to the throne—a woman, too, beautiful, virtuous, accomplished, beloved—she had removed from her path by a deed which burdened her forever afterwards with the conscience of a murderess. It is impossible to imagine a position as to which a monarch, and especially a woman, must have been more intensely sensitive than Elizabeth's. We should have expected that, in those days, no one would have dared to speak for it in a tone above a whisper. One wonders that a claimant of dramatic fame and theatrical success should have ventured to embody such a theme in one of his plays, unless he were prepared to maintain, with zealous positiveness, the legitimacy of the Queen's birth, and to paint the Holy See in the blackest colors for denying it. The whole spirit and bearing of the play is the other way, and to an extent quite remarkable. The epithet, "the nurse of justice," applied to the See of Rome, which had pronounced the Queen a bastard and a usurper, need not be insisted on, because it is Cardinal Wolsey who employs it, and of itself it need not prove the religious bias of the great dramatist any more than the prediction about Elizabeth which he places in the mouth of Cranmer. Yet in such a drama, where all hinges on the justice of the Papal sentence, especially taken in connection with other incidents and characteristics, the expression is not devoid of a certain significance. These incidents and characteristics lead any unbiassed mind to the conviction that the praise of Rome placed in the mouth of Cardinal Wolsey expressed also the sentiments of the writer. For example, the father of Elizabeth, who had torn his kingdom from the communion of the Pope because His Holiness would not play the minion to his lusts and divorce him from his lawful wife, is represented as a capricious tyrant, unscrupulous in the gratification of his desires, and a hypocrite of the deepest dye. Nay, more, the hypocrisy of the pretended qualms of conscience upon the strength of which he claimed a divorce from Katherine, is depicted with all the vividness and all the power of Shakespeare's unrivalled genius.

The play opens with the somewhat licentious revels of the King at Whitehall. At a gorgeous entertainment given by Cardinal Wolsey to his royal master, the latter enters with his attendants, "as maskers habited like shepherds." He chances to select as his partner in the ensuing dance Anne Bullen, daughter of Sir Thomas Bullen, Viscount Rochford. He has scarcely led her to the dance before he addresses her as follows:

"The fairest hand I ever touched! O, beauty,  
Till now I never knew thee."

After having thrown off his disguise, he makes inquiries of his chamberlain about his recent partner, and, having been informed by that official of her name and parentage, he adds :

“ By heaven, she is a dainty one,”

and immediately renews his addresses to the lady with a freedom permissible, we presume, only to a king and a tyrant.

“ Sweetheart,  
I were unmannerly to take you out  
And not to kiss you.”

The roystering monarch is represented closing the entertainment with the following gallantry, in which he intimates that his unbecoming attentions to his partner of the evening were not intended by him to be the indication of a mere passing caprice :

“ Lead in your ladies every one. Sweet partner,  
*I must not yet forsake you.* Let's be merry ;  
Good my lord cardinal, I have half a dozen healths  
To drink to these fair ladies, and a measure  
To lead them once again ; and then let's dream  
Who's best in favor.”

The next morning the dishonored girl finds herself Marchioness of Pembroke, with a handsome income wherewith to support the title.

Even here, under circumstances so disreputable for the King, the poet contrives to insert a compliment to Elizabeth.

“ I have perused her well,”

says the chamberlain, aside, whom the King has made the messenger of his interested bounty ;

“ Beauty and honor in her are so mingled,  
That they have caught the King, and who knows yet,  
But from this lady may proceed a gem  
To lighten all this isle ?”

But how equivocal a compliment in such a context ! Although he pays to Elizabeth herself a personal compliment, yet he seems to go beyond all ordinary prudence in exposing the disgrace of her parentage. The fair victim of the tyrant's unhallowed lust is represented as herself sympathizing with the injured wife.

“ Here's the pang that pinches :  
His highness having lived so long with her ; and she  
So good a lady that no tongue could ever  
Pronounce dishonor of her,—by my life,  
She never knew harm doing ;—O how, after  
So many courses of the sun enthron'd,  
Still growing in a majesty and pomp,—the which  
To leave is a thousand fold more bitter than  
'Tis sweet at first to acquire,—after this process,  
To give her the avaunt ! it is a pity  
Would move a monster.”

And when, by her elevation to a rank next to that of a duchess, the royal prodigal had made manifest the evil of his designs, she says,

“ It fainth me  
To think what follows.  
The Queen is comfortless, and we forgetful  
In our long absence.”

A miserable morality gives great latitude to this vice in princes. But Shakespeare invests the character of the author of the Anglican schism with still baser features. He depicts him as a mean and paltry hypocrite.

Says the lord chamberlain :

“ It seems the marriage with his brother's wife  
Has crept too near his conscience.”

To which the Duke of Suffolk replies :

“ No, his conscience  
Has crept too near another lady.”

With his living wife's successor already chosen, he further says, addressing Wolsey :

“ O, my lord,  
Would it not grieve an able man to leave  
So sweet a bedfellow ? but conscience, conscience,  
O, 'tis a tender place, and I must leave her.”

Again :

“ This respite shook  
The bosom of my conscience, entered me,  
Yea, with a splitting power, and made to tremble  
The region of my breast.”

And afterwards, to the court appointed to try the cause :

“ Thus hulling in  
The wild sea of my conscience, I did steer  
Toward this remedy, whereupon we are  
Now present here together ; that's to say,  
I meant to rectify my conscience, which  
I then did feel full sick, and yet not well,—  
By all the reverend fathers in the land,  
And doctors learned.”

And yet when this very court proceeded according to the forms of law, this very man of such tender conscience, impatient to commit his crime, thus speaks of these “ reverend fathers in the land and doctors learned :”

“ I may perceive  
These cardinals trifle with me ; I abhor  
This dilatory sloth, and tricks of Rome.  
My learned and well-beloved servant, Cranmer,  
Prythee, return ! With thy reproach, I know,  
My comfort comes along.”

The character of Wolsey, as drawn by Shakespeare, affords also presumptive evidence not a little convincing of his Catholic predilections. No intelligent person who studies it can believe it to have been drawn by a hearty adherent of the schism originated by Henry VIII. and continued by Elizabeth. It is difficult to suppose that a zealous Anglican, or an enemy of Rome, would have missed the opportunity of turning the authentic materials supplied by the history of a cardinal, and so illustrious a one, to the worst possible account. He would have loaded him with all the vices that generally accompany ambition. Not a redeeming feature would have been admitted. He would have been painted as evil in his fall as in his greatness; and if he had been permitted to be converted in the end, his conversion would have been one of the Protestant stamp.

Very different is the Wolsey of Shakespeare. Seizing, with remarkable fidelity, the leading characteristics revealed by his history, he nevertheless presents to us a noble character. The vice which defaces it is at least a great one. It is one which changed an archangel into a demon. He aspires to the most august dignity on earth, the chair of St. Peter. Boundless prodigality, at times not too scrupulous, the removal of every one who stood in his path, and the unworthy arts of a sycophantic courtier, are among the means he employs to reach his end. But the real nobility of the man shines through all. We feel as if he were a hero, who by some mischance has become a captive. We expect every moment to see him rend his fetters and be free. We are not kept long in suspense. His ambitious schemes crumble beneath him. His worldly greatness disappears like a morning dream. It is then that he becomes really great. The clogs which bound him earthward have fallen off, and the heaven-born nature rises to the summit of its greatness. A beneficent catastrophe has riven the coils of human ambition, and Wolsey is himself. We are inclined to despise him at his Whitehall revel, but when we hear him thus addressing Cromwell in answer to his inquiries:

"Never so truly happy, my dear Cromwell.  
I know myself now; and I feel within me  
A peace above all earthly dignities,  
A still and quiet conscience. The King has cured me;  
I humbly thank his grace, and from these shoulders,  
These ruined pillars, out of pity taken  
A load would sink a navy, too much honor;  
O, 'tis a burden, Cromwell, 'tis a burden,  
Too heavy for a man that hopes for heaven.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*

And, when I am forgotten, as I shall be,  
And sleep in dull cold marble, where no mention  
Of me must be heard of,—say I taught thee;

Say, Wolsey, that once trod the ways of glory,  
And sounded all the depths and shoals of honor,  
Found thee a way, out of his wreck, to rise in ;  
A sure and safe one, though thy master missed it.  
Mark but my fall, and that that ruined me.  
Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition :  
By that sin fell the angels ; how can man, then,  
The image of his Maker, hope to win by it ?  
Love thyself last : cherish those hearts that hate thee ;  
Corruption wins not more than honesty.  
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace,  
To silence envious tongues. Be just, and fear not :  
Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's,  
Thy God's, and truth's ; then if thou fall'st, O Cromwell,  
Thou fall'st a blessed martyr !"

And when at last, with his mortal sickness on him, we listen to him thus soliciting "the reverend abbot, with all his convent," who with the charity of religious had "honorably received him,"

"O, Father Abbot,  
An old man, broken with the storms of state,  
Is come to lay his weary bones among ye ;  
Give him a little earth for charity !"

we are fain to worship him.

The character of Wolsey in Henry VIII. is a creation of no un-Catholic hand. Within the limit of historical probability there was scope for making him an arch-villain. Such, under the circumstances, would he most certainly have been represented by an Elizabethan dramatist who was addicted to the new state of things and was disaffected toward the Roman See. In Shakespeare's hands, "this Cardinal," according to the description he himself gives of him in the mouth of Griffith, gentleman usher to Queen Katherine,

"Though from an humble stock, undoubtedly  
Was fashioned to much honor from his cradle.  
He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one ;  
Exceeding wise, fair spoken, and persuading :  
Lofty and sour to them that loved him not ;  
But to those men that sought him sweet as summer.  
And though he were unsatisfied in getting,  
Which was a sin, yet in bestowing, madam,  
He was most princely : ever witness for him  
Those twins of learning that he raised in you,  
Ipswich and Oxford ! one of which fell with him,  
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it ;  
The other, though unfinished, yet so famous,  
So excellent in art, and still so rising,  
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue.  
His overthrow heaped happiness upon him ;  
For then, and not till then, he felt himself,  
And found the blessedness of being little :  
And, to add greater honors to his age  
Than man could give him, he died fearing God."

Of similar significance, but even to a more striking degree, is the exquisite being whom the poet presents to us in Queen Katherine. This royal lady was the daughter of the most Catholic of earthly potentates, whose son—her brother, consequently—had meditated, nay, had attempted, the extirpation from England of Elizabeth and Protestantism together. She it was whom Elizabeth's father had abandoned in the teeth of the Church's censures for the shameful intercourse of which Elizabeth was the offspring. This is the lady whom he selects to adorn with all the charms of his magic pencil. And he does it of set purpose, as we learn from his epilogue; for whether that were written by himself or by Ben Jonson matters not. It must at all events have conveyed his sentiments. In it we are told:

“For this play, at this time, is only in  
The merciful construction of good women;  
For such a one we showed 'em.”

If we have been thus long detained by this play, it is because it appears to offer a whole body of evidence that its author was an adherent of the Catholic Church. The remainder of the evidence we shall adduce to a similar effect, will be culled here and there from his different dramas, and it will tend, we believe, to add very strong confirmation to the conclusion we have already drawn from the play of “Henry VIII.”

There is one characteristic of Shakespeare's writings which is not without its weight as confirmatory evidence of his religious convictions. They are everywhere pervaded by a spirit of gentleness and sweetness, as well as a deep sympathy with the infirmities of his fellow-creatures, which presents a really striking contrast to the acid acrimoniousness and demure self-righteousness of the new religionists of every sect and persuasion.

The whole temper and spirit of Shakespeare is eminently conservative. No writer ever lashed with more merciless severity the abuse of authority by men in office to the gratification of their own selfish ends.

On the other hand, no writer has ever placed on a more lofty eminence, nor surrounded with nobler attributes, the legitimate exercise of authority on the one hand, and of dutiful obedience on the other. There was nothing of the revolutionist or free-thinker about him. His was a nature which had no more sympathy with rebellion than with tyranny. His exalted genius was little likely to be fooled by the modern inconsistency of divorcing independence of faith in religion and independence of action in morals. His plays overflow with satirical allusions to the license of thought and action introduced by the then recent revolt from the Catholic Church. His arrows aimed at the sectaries, none of which miss their mark,

hurtle in the atmosphere which surrounds them. Of such sort, we take it, is the song of the tipsy monster in the "Tempest:"

"No more dams I'll make for fish;  
Nor fetch in firing  
At requiring;  
Nor scrape trencher, nor wash dish;  
'Ban, 'Ban; Calaliban  
Has a new master; get a new man.

Freedom, hey-day! hey-day, freedom! freedom, hey-day, freedom!"

To Escalus, whom the Duke of Vienna had deputed, with another, to govern in his absence, and who had inquired of his sovereign, who had unexpectedly returned disguised, "What news abroad i' the world?" "None," replies the Duke, "but that there is so great a fever on goodness that the dissolution of it must cure it; novelty is only in request, and it is as dangerous to be aged in any kind of course as it is virtuous to be constant in any undertaking. There is scarce truth enough alive to make societies secure; but security enough to make fellowships accursed. Much upon this riddle runs the wisdom of the world. This news is old enough, yet it is every day's news."

"Why, headstrong liberty is lashed with woe," says Luciana, in the "Comedy of Errors," to her sister, Adriana, who is pleading with her for "woman's rights."

In "Love's Labor's Lost," the Princess replies to a forester who had changed his mind as to her beauty, after receiving a gratuity from her:

"See, see, my beauty will be *saved by merit!*  
*O heresy in fair, fit for these days!*  
A giving hand, though foul, shall have fair praise."

Beatrice, in "Much Ado About Nothing," says, in contempt of Benedick: "He wears his faith but as the fashion of his hat, it ever changes with the next block."

"*Though honesty be no Puritan,*" says the clown in "All's Well that Ends Well," "yet it will do no hurt, it will wear the surplice of humility over the black gown of a big heart." This is evidently an allusion to the new vestments affected by the ministers of the new Evangel.

Of a yet more profound satirical significance, as against the recently introduced license of private judgment, is the following speech of Lafeu in the same play:

"They say miracles are past; and we have our philosophical persons, to make modern and familiar, things supernatural and causeless. Hence is it that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit ourselves to an unknown fear."

When Gardiner, in Henry VIII., speaking of the new heresies, of partaking of which Cranmer was accused, says:



"If we suffer,  
 Out of our easiness and childish pity  
 To one man's honor, this contagious sickness,  
 Farewell all physic; and what follows then?  
 Commotions, uproars, with a general taint  
 Of the whole state: as, of late days, our neighbors,  
 The upper Germany, can dearly witness,  
 Yet freshly pitied in our memories,"

he urges only what might be looked for in the mouth of a Catholic prelate. But the appeals to the "commotions," "uproars," "with a general taint of the whole state," which did actually follow the introduction of the new heresies; and still more where he makes his appeal to the existing state of "our neighbors the upper Germany," he goes far beyond what is needed for the verisimilitude of the character, and indicates the bearing of his own opinions.

It is in harmony with this criticism, and confirms the conclusion there seems to be every reason to adopt—that Shakespeare was a Catholic—that in every case, if our memory does not mislead us, in which he draws the character of a clergyman of the state orders, he makes him an object of contempt and derision. Sir Hugh Evans, for example, the Welsh parson, in "Merry Wives of Windsor." It needed Shakespeare's comic genius to create so ludicrous an individual as this "Jack-priest," as he is termed. That he is not a priest wielding the jurisdiction of the Church is evident. There is not an instance of Shakespeare heaping contempt on any such. But poor Sir Hugh only appears to provoke our derision. We are not left in any doubt as to whether it is a Catholic priest or one of the state clergy the poet intends to portray, for first the epithet "parson," which would seem to be the special property of the Anglican clergy, is assigned. Next, the French doctor presumably, therefore, a Catholic, and it is to be hoped a gentleman, would scarcely have so far forgotten himself, however enraged, as to have heaped torrents of opprobrious epithets on a man who, on account of his profession, was unable to resent them. A priest could not have fought a duel; a parson, it appears, could. Again, the precise epithets selected by the peppery Frenchman single out his equivocal orders as the object of his insult. Thus he calls him a Jack-priest: "By gar, he is de coward Jack-priest of de world;" a Jack-dog-priest: "Scurvy Jack-dog-priest!" by gar, me vill cut his ears." And lastly the enraged French Esculapius mocks him with

---

<sup>1</sup> This epithet, "Jack," applied to any rank or title, was a bitterly contumelious equivalent to the *pseudo* of modern use. A Jack-priest conveyed a similar meaning to the expression, *tulchan* bishop, applied by the Scotch Presbyterians to the Protestant bishops, to distinguish them from the Catholic ones. A *tulchan* is a calf-skin stuffed with straw, used by some of the Scotch farmers to impose upon a cow whose real calf has been removed from her, in order to induce her to give down her milk.

the Bible-mongering which so markedly characterized the votaries of the new religion. "By gar he has save his soul, dat he is no come; he has pray his Pible vell, dat he is no come."

Another instance of the kind is Nathaniel, the curate, in "Love's Labor's Lost"—a character of a different sort, but as ridiculous in its way as that of Sir Hugh. There is no more doubt of his ecclesiastical standing than that of the latter. "Master parson—*quasi* person," says Holofernes, addressing him. Jaquenetta addresses him as "Good master parson." His ecclesiastical style and kind are fixed, too, by the following expressions: "Sir, I praise the Lord for you." Again: "I praise God for you, sir." So, also: "Sir, you have done this in the fear of God, very religiously." The following smacks still stronger of the Protestant flavor: "And thank you, too; for society (*saieth the text*) is the happiness of life." No Catholic priest ever talked like this.

The character of Sir Oliver Martext would seem to place the object and intention of Shakespeare beyond all controversy. The very name is redolent of Puritanism. He makes but one short appearance on the stage, and that for no conceivable object we can conjecture but that of inviting the derision of the audience to the ecclesiastical pretensions of the state clergy.

A clown has invoked his assistance to marry him quickly and suddenly to Audrey. "Will you dispatch us here under this tree?" the clown had asked; "or *shall we go with you to your chapel?*" The ceremony is interrupted, at its commencement, by the misanthropic Jaques:

"And will you," he asks, "being a man of your breeding, be married under a bush like a beggar? Get you to *church*, and have a good priest that can tell you what marriage is; this fellow will but join you together as they join wainscot; then one of you will prove a shrunk panel, and, like green timber, warp, warp."

To this the jester replies:

"I am not in the mind but I were better to be married of him than of another: for he is not like to marry me well; and not being well married, it will be a good excuse for me hereafter to leave my wife."

Jaques perseveres:

"Go thou with me," he says, "and let me counsel thee."

The clown is persuaded; he says:

"Come, sweet Audrey:  
We must be married, or we must live in bawdry.  
Farewell, good master Oliver: not,—  
O sweet Oliver,  
O brave Oliver,  
Leave me not behind thee:  
But—Wind away,  
Begone, I say,  
I will not to wedding with thee."

It must have been a bitter mortification to the vicar of the parish to have his ecclesiastical pretensions thus slighted by a clown ; but he resigned himself to it in consideration of its advantages, as his successors do to this day.

" 'Tis no matter," he says : " ne'er a fantastical knave of them all shall flout me out of my calling."

Interspersed amongst the human and superhuman multitude created by the immortal dramatist are many real priests, bishops, and religious. Not one of them is made an object of ridicule. In no case are their ecclesiastical pretensions made an object of scorn. In every instance the genuineness of their position and of their spiritual position, is taken as a recognized fact. He does not make, it is true, a saint of every one of them. On the contrary, he makes of some few of them very great sinners, as, for example, Cardinal Beaufort, in the second part of *King Henry VI.* He would not be carrying out his own principle of "holding the mirror up to nature," if he did not. No one is foolish enough to suppose that there was ever a time when not a bad man was to be found among the clergy of the Catholic Church. If even amongst the twelve who constituted her original episcopate one was an arch criminal, it would be too much to expect that the clergy of the universal world should be free from the contamination. But his bad priests are the exception ; and they are chiefly in high places, where the world has made them its prey. In this he is equally true to fact. An abettor of the new opinions would have depicted every priest and every bishop, but especially every religious, as a master of iniquity ; or, if they had conceded any virtue to any one of them, they would have dealt it out with right niggard hand.

Perhaps in no particular does Shakespeare indicate more clearly his Catholic convictions than in the characters he draws of the regular clergy. The religious of whatever order were especially obnoxious to the so-called reformers. They hated them with a deadly brotherly hatred. It may be that they felt the holy severity of their rules, and the real beauty of their actions, to be, as a general rule, a reproach cast upon their favorite doctrine of faith without works. But, almost without exception, Shakespeare's religious are men of lovable characters, ever busied in doing some office of kindness to their fellow-creatures, and unaffectedly manifesting in their actions the holy maxims of the religion they profess. In short, the whole idea he conveys of the religious life throughout his plays is one of the purest and most exalted description. In the famous case of mistaken identity upon which the "*Comedy of Errors*" is founded, one of the twins takes refuge in a priory from the exasperations occasioned by the mistake. Under the impression that he is out of his wits, his wife demands him to be produced.

The Abbess refuses ; she says :

“ He took this place for sanctuary,  
And it shall privilege him from your hands,  
Till I have brought him to his wits again,  
Or lose my labor in assaying it.”

And again :

“ Be patient ; for I will not let him stir  
Till I have used the approved means I have,  
With wholesome syrups, drugs and holy prayers,  
To make of him a formal man again ;  
It is a branch and parcel of mine oath,  
A charitable duty of my order.”

And when his wife invokes justice of the Duke he replies :

“ She is a virtuous and a reverend lady ;  
It cannot be that she hath done thee wrong.”

The Duke, in “ Measure for Measure,” although only a friar in disguise, maintains his disguise as follows :

“ Bound by my charity and my blest order,  
I come to visit the afflicted spirits  
Here in the prison.”

In the same play, a nun describes thus the rule of her house to Isabella, a novice :

“ When you have vow’d, you must not speak with men  
But in the presence of the prioress ;  
Then, if you speak, you must not show your face.”

Lucio, who has obtained an interview with Isabella in subordination to these rules, says :

“ I hold you as a thing ensky’d and sainted,  
By your renouncement an immortal spirit ;  
And to be talked with in sincerity  
As with a saint.”

How beautiful is the office performed by the friar in “ Much Ado About Nothing !” A suspicion has been brought upon the virtue of Hero, who is on the eve of being married to her lover, by the wiles of a villain. The facts arranged by his contrivance there appear to be no means of disproving. The friar, who had been a patient listener throughout the accusation, at length interposes thus :

“ Hear me a little ; for I have only been  
Silent so long and given way unto  
This course of fortune, . . . .  
By noting of the lady I have marked  
A thousand blushing apparitions  
To start into her face, a thousand innocent shames  
In angel whiteness beat away those blushes ;  
And in her eye there hath appear’d a fire,  
To burn the errors that these princes hold  
Against her maiden truth. Call me a fool ;

Trust not my reading nor my observations,  
Which with experimental seal doth warrant  
The tenor of my book; trust not my age,  
My reverence, calling, nor divinity,  
If this sweet lady lie not guiltless here  
Under some biting error."

And he was right.

Equally benevolent and lovable is the part assigned to Friar Laurence in "Romeo and Juliet;" equally pious and instructive his sayings. Among them we may quote the following :

"For nought so vile that on the earth doth live  
But to the earth some special good doth give;  
Nor aught so good but strained from that fair use  
Revolts from true birth, stumbling on abuse:  
Virtue itself turns vice, being misapplied;  
And vice sometimes by action dignified."

The good old man, in order to do a kindness to two loving souls, and above all in the hope of reconciling two princely houses, upon whose enmity rests the plot of the deepest tragedy written by our poet, puts his life as well as his character in extremest peril. Indeed, only an accidental coincidence actually saves him at last from an unjust suspicion of the foulest crimes.

This play affords still another example of the consistency with which our author invariably represents the religious as engaged in works of charity. Friar Laurence dispatches one of his subjects, Friar John, on a message to Mantua. It is a message of life and death to the hero and heroine of the play. He is prevented from his journey by a most unlucky accident, the account of which we will let the good friar give in his own words :

"Going to find a barefoot brother out,  
One of our order, to associate me,  
Here in this city visiting the sick,  
And finding him, the searchers of the town,  
Suspecting that we both were in a house  
Where the infectious pestilence did reign,  
Seal'd up the doors, and would not let us forth;  
So that my speed to Mantua there was stay'd."

The very way of expressing himself, the turn he gives to events, the familiarity he evidences with the customs and phraseology of the Church, as well as with the discipline and habits of the Religious life, all indicate the Catholic. Had one of the new religion written "As You Like It," the conversion of the Duke would have consisted of loud protestations of what a sinner he was, irreverently familiar invocations of the Lord, professions of having seen him, with a profusion of self-righteous humility, and intensely conceited

self-abasement, depreciation of works as "filthy rags," and high-flown claims of being a chosen vessel, and a particular favorite of the Lord.

The very last thing that would have occurred to such a one would have been to make the Duke renounce his crown, strip himself of all earthly goods, and go in poverty and penitence to hide his conversion in a holy community of monks.

But it is time for us to draw these remarks to a conclusion. There is much more evidence at hand to the same effect. Enough, however, has been adduced to justify a very strong prepossession in favor of the Catholic faith of Shakespeare. In conclusion, it may be added that in a thousand different ways, in casual expressions, seemingly indifferent incidents, and a multitude of ways too numerous to particularize, he displays the habit of thought of a Catholic. His lay characters "say their beads," "go to confession," receive "the last sacraments," "pray for the dead," "invoke the saints," speak with reverence of our Lady, and so on. He speaks of the blessing of the Church as being essential to an honest marriage. Addressing Friar Laurence, Romeo says :

"How hast thou heart,  
Being a divine, a ghostly confessor,  
A sin absolver."

In the play of Hamlet, the circumstance of the king's assassination, which the spirit of the slain father names to his son as the cruellest, and calling the loudest for vengeance, is, to quote his own words :

"Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin,  
Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd ;  
No reckoning made, but sent to my account  
With all my imperfections on my head."

The impartiality of criticism demands, before concluding, that we quote the only passage with which we are acquainted, which militates with any force against the supposition that Shakespeare was a believer in the Catholic faith. In "Romeo and Juliet," Juliet is represented saying to Friar Laurence :

"Are you at leisure, holy father, now ;  
Or shall I come to you *at evening mass* ?"

This, it must be owned, is a puzzler, if Shakespeare wrote it. There is no Catholic, in these days, so ignorant as to talk of an evening mass. It seems to drive us to one of three conclusions,—that Shakespeare did not thus write it ; that the ignorance of ordinary Catholics respecting the services of the Church in those days was dense ; or that Shakespeare was not a Catholic.

We doubt if one of those who have done us the honor of perusing this article, will be likely to adopt the last conclusion, in face of the evidence we have adduced to the contrary. The complete knowledge which he everywhere displays of the doctrines and discipline of the Catholic Church make the second conclusion untenable. There remains but the first. As to that, every one must form his own opinion. For our own part, we could not allow a single expression to weigh against the overwhelming testimony to the contrary afforded by all his writings. Shakespeare wrote, we know, with great rapidity, and almost without corrections. The exigencies of his plot may have seemed to him for the moment to require an evening mass, and he may have let it pass without caring much for its exact accuracy.

This hypothesis is favored by the fact that one or two very gross anachronisms are to be met with in his plays. Great geniuses are seldom very careful about particulars.

Be this as it may, if our humble efforts should have met with so much success as, in the estimation of the dispassionate reader, to have rescued so illustrious an intellect from the heretical crowd, and to have shown it manifestly crowned with the diadem of faith, ours will have been a labor of love.

---

## HOW HERESY DEALS WITH THE BIBLE.

*The Holy Bible.* According to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611); with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New Testament, Vol. I.: St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1878. Royal 8vo.

**I**F one could only swallow in good faith the boastful talk about the growth of Bible-knowledge, which has resounded through the world for the last three centuries, and which has gone on from year to year, widening its pretensions and increasing its braggart tone of self-laudation, he must needs acknowledge that this science has reached its highest point, or that it lacks very little of attaining to perfection. It is constantly dinned into our ears, in every place, from the nursery to the reading-desk and pulpit, through every channel, from the child's story-book or the daily newspaper to the learned controversial tome, that the Bible, after having been chained, hidden, suppressed, and wellnigh extinguished for over a thousand years, was at last, in an unfortunate hour for the Church of Rome, happily recovered and brought to the light of day by the monk of Wittemberg. To use Luther's own rough expression, he first "dragged it out from under the bench." Or, as Dean Stanley, in his late New York sermon, phrased it, in choicer terms, "Martin Luther first loosed the shackles of the old restraint and taught us *what the Bible really was.*" It is not so easy to determine the sense and discover the truth of this bold assertion. If, by these words, are meant the nature and character of the Bible, it would be easy to show, by a thousand witnesses, that in every age of the Christian Church, from St. Peter down to Leo X., Luther's contemporary, the Bible was believed and acknowledged by all, clergy and laity, to be the inspired word of God, dictated by the Holy Ghost to faithful scribes for the benefit of mankind. Was Luther, then, the first to discover and disclose a truth which had been in the hearts and on the lips of all Christians, young and old, for fifteen centuries? It must be a bold, brazen face, indeed, that can, without blushing, repeat this before the Christian world; and forcibly recalls those who are denounced in Ezechiel as a "domus exasperans, filii dura facie et indomabili corde."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ezech. ii. 5, 4. "The provoking generation, the hard-faced, stiff-hearted race." There was no necessity for Dr. Challoner's changing into "obstinate" the "heart that cannot be tamed" of the old Douay, which is the correct rendering of St. Jerome's "indomabili corde." His changes are seldom improvements on the old version.



If, on the other hand, not the character of the Bible, but its true sense and meaning were intended by the speaker, it would be a sufficient answer that the Catholic Church did not learn, and needed not to learn from Luther; and it is simply absurd to represent her as either asking or receiving at his hands a key to the knowledge that she already possessed, and that she had been dispensing to the world for so many centuries. Luther taught no knowledge of the Bible to the Catholic Church, and the greater part of the Christian world—the fact must not be lost sight of—belongs to her communion.

But "he taught us," says Dean Stanley, "what the Bible really was." And pray, who are "we?" Surely, he does not mean the great common crowd, especially the unlearned, who go under the name of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, etc. For these, in spite of their varying names and common theory, respect the fundamental tenets of Christianity, and, above all, cling in practice (whatever they may say or imagine to the contrary) to the great Catholic principle of authority, believing the Scriptures to be the Word of God *only* because they have so learnt from parental and Sunday-school teaching, and having their minds fully made up (even though they fancy otherwise) to understand the Bible when they read it *only* in the sense which their minister directly enforces, or indirectly suggests; and all this, because, in their innocent simplicity, they believe him to be an authorized interpreter of Divine truth. No; the Anglican divine never once thought or spoke in the name of these men, though they form the great bulk of that non-Catholic world which yet preserves something more than the empty name of Christianity. But, in his eyes, they are of no account; they are mere *laymen*, professionally speaking. Nay, perhaps, he counts them little better than "lewd fellows of the baser sort," to use the language of his own cherished Anglican version. While addressing the New York congregation, with mild amiable egotism he was thinking, not of the great Protestant world that has yet its remnant of Christian faith, but of the advanced biblical students of Germany and England, who have taken Luther's principles to heart, and are not ashamed to carry out to the end their logical consequences. These are they whose biblical knowledge is daily progressing in subtle doubt and bold denial, the champions of what they call by the high-sounding name of Liberal or Rational Christianity.

Amongst them Dean Stanley ranks foremost, and if he had spoken out his true sentiments on that occasion, instead of the vague, unmeaning phrase which he gave out, he would have said something to this effect: "Luther taught us something new, indeed, about the Bible, something unheard of in all Christian gen-

erations, when he taught that its dead letter was a rule of faith, which every one was at liberty to interpret. This was, indeed, a valuable discovery, for its direct tendency was to emancipate reason from the shackles of faith, and its importance will only be fully understood in the age for which we are preparing the way, when faith shall not only be dethroned but extinct, and reason shall be sole mistress of the world. But Luther likewise taught us many things about the Bible which we have unlearned long since, and put away from us as fit only for children and pious idiots, whether they be silly laymen or pretentious churchmen. Even that great man, Paul, had his lot fallen in our enlightened day, would as he says himself (1 Cor. xiii. 11), put them away from him as childish things. We hold, with Luther, that the Bible is a very nice, very interesting book, but we have only a smile of pity for the delusion that holds it to be divinely inspired. Besides, Luther's Christology was very imperfect. It could not well be otherwise, as he drew from unenlightened sources. He had imbibed all the quibbles of the Nicene theologians, all the subtleties of the monkish schoolmen. But we may pardon Luther, for the very apostles seem to have been full of lofty Messianic theories, imported into the Church from Judaism, or rather Rabbinism. We now know, what Luther unfortunately did not, that Christ was nothing more than one of the great Teachers and Apostles of humanity, and, it may be granted, superior to Zoroaster, Confucius, Mahomet, and many others who went before or came after him." If Dean Stanley had spoken thus, he would have uttered the real sentiments of the school he represents. But it would be disclosing too much. The Catholic Church, it would seem, is not the only one that strives to hoodwink her hearers and disciples, and keep them from knowing too much. But all this is a digression from our main purpose.

We are further perpetually reminded, lest we should forget it, by these self-constituted advisers, that while biblical science has been progressing among the sects and other outsiders, Catholics have remained in ignorance. They are fettered by the chains of Church authority. If they would only make bold to unshackle themselves, to exercise their own judgment in rejecting or adopting this or that book, in deciding on the sense of this or that passage, they would possess the key of knowledge, and soon become masters in the science of Scriptural exegesis. All this may sound very well, and those who utter it so pompously pride themselves, perhaps, on their originality. But the Church has a life of eighteen centuries or more, and her memory is yet fresh and unimpaired, as it was in the days of her youth. She remembers well how this same language has resounded in her ears almost from the earliest period of her existence. The heretics whom she cast out of her

bosom from the very beginning, because they attempted to ground their wicked opinions on false interpretations of the inspired writings, would not give up their delusion, if such it really were, even when driven out of her communion. They believed, or affected to believe, that they alone understood the sacred books, and that Catholics, who clung to the authority of the Church in interpreting the sense of Scripture, gave proof thereby of their folly and ignorance.<sup>1</sup> They invited them to come out and share with them the privilege of deciding what books to reject and what to retain, and in those retained of expounding the text by the aid of private judgment. They assured them that only thus could they be rescued from their unhappy state of ignorance, and attain the blessed knowledge of Scriptures in all its fulness.

St. Irenæus testifies this of his own times: "They (heretics) seduce the minds of the unlearned; and by falsifying the divine oracles, or by wrongfully explaining what was rightfully said, draw them into bondage, and, *under pretext of science*, overthrow the faith of many."<sup>2</sup>

St. Augustine reiterates the same complaint, that they attempted to "deceive Catholics by *false promises of reason and science*."<sup>3</sup> And, again, in his *Sermons on the Psalms*, he warns his hearers against "those who are enemies of Christ's dispensation, inasmuch as they forbid us to believe the Unknown, and hold out to us on their part a promise of certain knowledge, as all heretics are accustomed to do."<sup>4</sup> And Tertullian had long before said of them the same thing: "They are all swollen with pride; they all profess to bestow knowledge with certainty."<sup>5</sup> St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, reproaches them with trying "to gain over unwary Catholics by their smooth tongue and plausible discourse."<sup>6</sup> They professed their anxiety to deliver Catholics from a grievous yoke, and render them self-taught. Their alluring promises are thus stated by St. Augustine, who had known them from his own sad experience:

<sup>1</sup> St. Irenæus says: "While wonderfully extolling themselves, they inveigh against us as unlearned and utterly ignorant." *Nos ut indoctos ac prorsus ignaros insectantur, seipsos autem mirifice extollunt.*—Opera Ed. Massuet., Paris, 1720, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Seducunt mentem imperitorum, eosque depravandis oraculis divinis, iisque quæ recte dicta sunt male exponendis captivos trahunt, scientiæque pretextu multos evertunt.* Opp., p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Hæretici rationis et scientiæ falsa pollicitatione decipiunt.*—Lib. vi., de Musica. Inter Opp., Aug. Venetiis, 1730, tom. 1, col. 540.

<sup>4</sup> *Inimicos huic dispensationi quæ facta est per Jesum Christum . . . generaliter accipere debemus omnes qui vetant credere incognita et certam scientiam pollicentur, sicut faciunt hæretici universi.*—Enarrationes in Psalmos (in Psalm viii, v. 3, Ex ore infantium, etc.)

<sup>5</sup> *Omnes tument: omnes scientiam pollicentur.*—Lib. Præscript., cap. lxi.

<sup>6</sup> *Δια τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ τῆς εὐλῳστίας.*—S. Cyrilli, Opp. Ed. Touttée. Venetiis, 1763, p. 52.

"To those whom they wish to entrap they promise to explain everything, no matter how obscure, and then blame the Catholic Church chiefly on this account, that she commands all who come to her to BELIEVE; but they boast that they impose no necessity of believing, but open the sources of teaching."<sup>1</sup>

The bold, defiant, dogmatic tone, in which heretics give out their interpretations of Scripture, as if no one could understand it but themselves, was set down long ago by St. Augustine as a characteristic mark of heresy. He says: "In no other way have heresies arisen, and perverse doctrines that ensnare souls and cast them into the abyss, than because the Scriptures, which are good in themselves, are ill understood, and what is thus ill understood is rashly and boldly asserted."<sup>2</sup> They went further, and instead of following the Scripture, which was originally their pretence, assumed to be its absolute masters and arbiters, rejecting or receiving both text and sense as it suited their whims. "See," says St. Augustine to them, "how you are bringing about the destruction of all Scripture authority by making one's private opinion the judge of what he is to approve or disapprove in Scripture; in other words, every one, instead of becoming subject to faith by Scripture authority, subjects the Scripture to himself, so that nothing pleases him, because it is vouched for by this high authority; but each one considers it written well, because it pleases him."<sup>3</sup> They looked on it as their privilege to accept or discard any portion or book of Scripture, as their private judgment or caprice prompted them.<sup>4</sup> Their critical eye discovered at a glance, says St. Jerome, which Epistle was Paul's and which was not; and their decision was pronounced, adds the holy Doctor, "with the magisterial tone so peculiar to heresy."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ita ut eis, quos illectant, rationem se de obscurissimis rebus polliceantur reddituros eoque Catholicam maxime criminantur quod illis, qui ad eam veniunt, præcipitur ut credant, se autem non jugum credendi imponere, sed docendi fontem aperire gloriantur.—De Utilitate Credendi ad Honorat., cap. ix. tom. viii. p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Neque enim natæ sunt hæreses, et quædam dogmata perversitatis illaqueantia animas et in profundum præcipitantia, nisi dum scripturæ bonæ intelliguntur non bene, et quod in eis non bene intelligitur etiam temere et audacter asseritur.—In Ioan. Tract. xviii. tom. iii. col. 430.

<sup>3</sup> Videtis ergo id vos agere ut omnis de medio scripturarum auferatur auctoritas, et suus cuique animus auctor sit quid in quaque scriptura probet, quid improbet; id est ut non auctoritate scripturæ subjiciatur ad fidem sed sibi scripturas ipse subjiciat; non ut ideo illi placeat aliquid quia hoc in sublimi auctoritate scriptum legitur, sed ideo recte scriptum videatur quia hoc illi placuit.—Adv. Faust Lib. xxxii. cap. xvii. tom. viii. col. 461.

<sup>4</sup> They call it their *privilege*, but (adds the Saint, indignantly) *sacrilege* would be the truer name. "Eas (the Scriptures) . . . sic excipiunt ut suo quodam privilegio, immo sacrilegio, quod volunt sumant, quod nolunt rejiciant."—De Dono Persever., No. 26, tom. x. 834.

<sup>5</sup> Cum hæretica auctoritate pronuncient et dicant: illa Epistola Pauli est, hæc non est.—Proem, in Ep. ad Titum.

They cast away, as they pleased, verses, chapters, and whole books, in a word, any and everything that seemed to stand in the way of their favorite doctrines, whether of their own coining or borrowed from the philosophy of the learned Pagan world that surrounded them. Thus Marcion rejected the entire Old Testament. In this he was imitated by the Priscillianists and the Manicheans. Dositheus, as St. Jerome says, was willing to admit the Pentateuch, but would not hear of the Prophets, or other inspired writers before Christ.<sup>1</sup> Theodore of Mopsuesta, whose rationalism has made him quite a hero in the eyes of modern biblical students,<sup>2</sup> despised the book of Job as the work of some learned heathen. He was willing to acknowledge that Solomon was the author of Proverbs, the Canticle, and Ecclesiastes; but flatly denied the inspiration of these books, and cast them with contempt from the canon of Scripture. He proscribed also the Paralipomena or Chronicles and the Books of Esdras, with the Catholic Epistle of St. James.<sup>3</sup>

But it was not in the books of the Old Testament only that heretics exercised their detestable "privilege" of private judgment, or, as it is now called by a high-sounding word, criticism. Of the New Testament the heretic Marcion, says St. Irenæus,<sup>4</sup> admitted only the Gospel of St. Luke and the Epistles of St. Paul; but even this is limited by the testimony of Clement of Alexandria and St. Jerome, who affirms that he rejected the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Cerinthus and the Ebionites would not hear of St. John's Gospel. Such also was the case with the Alogians, whose name (enemies of the Word) stamps them as forerunners of the Arian heresy. Not content with rejecting all the writings of St. John, they went still farther. In order to heap insult on the holy Evangelist and the Disciple "whom Jesus loved," they had the face to attribute his Gospel to the very heretic (Cerinthus) against whom it was written. Tatian and his followers, the Encratites, could not bring themselves to believe in the Acts, nor in St. Paul's Epistles. The Manicheans and other raving blasphemers of the Holy Ghost, as St. Irenæus says, in order to make void the gift of the Spirit, rejected St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul. On the

<sup>1</sup> Dositheus was unquestionably a Samaritan; but his relations with Simon Magus, to whom he held the position, first of master, and then of disciple, will admit of his being classed with Christian heretics.

<sup>2</sup> Even Catholics of rationalistic tendency, like F. Simon, cannot conceal their admiration of this forerunner of the new exegesis.

<sup>3</sup> This we learn from Leontius Byzantinus, and as we have no copy of his work we can only refer to the authority of the learned Augustinian, Christianus Lupus, in his *Scholia* to the work of Tertullian, *De Præscriptionibus*.—See *Christiani Lupi Opera*, Venetiis, 1727, tom. ix. p. 168.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. III. Adv. Haer. cap. xi. ed. cit. p. 192.

contrary, the Valentinians gave the preference to St. John and made frequent and abundant use of his Gospel, as St. Irenæus relates. Others who blasphemously separated Jesus from the Christ, drawing a distinction between Jesus who suffered and Christ who remained impassible, extolled St. Mark, and preferred his Gospel, because they foolishly imagined that it favored their unchristian error (St. Irenæus, p. 190). The Arians showed themselves rightful heirs of the spirit of heresy by rejecting the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But sometimes they did not think it necessary or expedient to repudiate entire books. To cast aside a portion answered their purpose, and they acted accordingly. Thus Tertullian says of one of the heresies of his day: "*Ista hæresis non recipit quasdam scripturas, et si quas recipit, non recipit integras.*" (De Præscript., cap. xvii.) "This sect does not admit some books of Scripture, and those that it admits, it will not admit whole and entire." Marcion acknowledged St. Luke's Gospel, but only after he had clipped and pared it to suit himself, or his theory rather. He left out the genealogy, which is at the beginning, with many things out of our Lord's discourses; and, as St. Irenæus playfully remarks, he seems to have succeeded in convincing his followers, that by giving them only a part of the Gospel he had proved himself wiser than the Apostle who had given it in its entirety to the Church. St. Epiphanius says that the Gospel of St. Luke, as it came from Marcion's hands, mutilated in its beginning, middle, and end, could only be compared to a moth-eaten garment. In the same way this precursor of the new exegesis cut out of St. Paul's Epistles all mention of God as Creator of the world. Though, like all heretics, inconsistent with himself even in this plan of warfare against revealed truth, he seems to have been the first who adopted this ingenious expedient of expunging obnoxious passages, instead of throwing out the whole book. The words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "*Marcion primus est ausus etc.*," and of St. Irenæus, "*solus manifeste est ausus*," etc., imply this much. By *solus* St. Irenæus means the "only one" down to his day. Cerinthus and the Ebionites did the same thing with St. Matthew's Gospel. St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Epiphanius accuse the Arians of omitting or otherwise falsifying portions of the Gospel of St. John. St. Athanasius says that the Macedonians wilfully corrupted the text of St. Paul to the Romans. Anastasius Sinaita bears positive witness that the Eutychians cut out of St. Mark and St. Luke the verses that tell of our Lord's agony and bloody sweat in the Garden of Olives.

One of the Holy Fathers (quoted by Eusebius, though without

mention of his name) speaking of these wicked corrupters of Holy Writ, and referring especially to Theodotus of Byzantium, Artemo, and their followers, begins a long invective with these words, "Sacras audacter depravant Scriptures," etc. "They unblushingly falsify the Holy Scriptures;" and after a little continues thus: "I can scarcely believe that they are unaware of the folly and rashness of this desperate attempt of theirs. For they either do not hold that the sacred and divine Scriptures were dictated by the Holy Ghost, or they must make out that they are wiser than the Holy Ghost. What else is this than the madness of those who are, as it were, bodily possessed by the Devil?"

Can anything be more horrible in the eyes of him who has the blessing of faith in addition to the Christian name, than this wicked, deliberate falsifying of God's revealed Word! What a depth of blasphemous pride and contempt of God's infinite wisdom and truth is disclosed by such attempts! Well does St. Ambrose intimate, that the Devil would scarcely venture to make so bold. When on one occasion he quoted Scripture to tempt our Lord in the desert, we are justly shocked by the detestable impudence of the arch-fiend in attempting to turn the written Word of God against its Divine Author. But in extenuation it may be said, that he quoted correctly, and only endeavored to insinuate a false meaning. He did not venture to tamper with or falsify the text. But what Satan dared not do against our Lord living in the flesh, heresy dares against Him yet living and teaching amongst us in the person of the Church, His spouse. Nor is this any strained metaphor of figurative language. It is His own positive declaration. Her teaching is not her own but His, just in the same way that His teaching, to use His own words, was not His own but of the Father who sent Him. (John xiv. 24.) And we have His express warrant for it when He says to the teaching body of the Church: "As the Father hath sent me, so do I send you." "He who heareth you, heareth me, and he who despiseth you despiseth me." (John xxi. 21; Luke x. 16.) And after thus insulting and trampling on God's Word, and despising the Church and Him from whose hands she came no less than the Scripture which He intrusted to her keeping, does heresy ever betray a sense of shame or even consciousness of having sinned? Far from it; she glories in her shame. Her type was prefigured long ago in the wicked woman of Solomon (Prov. xxx. 20), who after her sin "eateth and wipeth her mouth," and coolly asks, "Wherein have I offended? Stand aloof and touch me not, for I glory in being the work of man's hands, and I know that I am far better and holier than the Church founded by Christ and spread through the world by His Apostles." This is virtually the language that heresy has spoken

ever since the days of Simon Magus. All this may be blindness, and no doubt such it is, but voluntary and inexcusable, the blindness of deadly sin. Who does not recognize in this the depth spoken of by the Prophet,<sup>1</sup> into which when a man has once fallen, the indifference which followed upon loss of faith is succeeded by scorn and contempt of God and His teachings! It seems a hard and awful saying; but how can we help considering those who act thus, as on the verge, if not in the actual state, of final reprobation, seeing how thoroughly imbued they are with the spirit of Satan, if not positively crazed and maddened, as the Holy Father above quoted says, by his bodily possession.

But there was another and subtler way of falsifying the Scriptures, and

Nequid inausum  
Aut intrectatum scelerisve dolive fuisset,

heresy had recourse to this likewise. It consisted in leaving the text unaltered, but meanwhile altering the sense by artful glozing and deceitful commentary. And this is better for heresy's purpose, for it misleads more silently and more effectually. Any attempt to mutilate the text by addition or retrenchment is too often accompanied by awkwardness and bungling, that are sure to be examined and thus bring home detection and shame to the forgers. But the sense of Scripture is something more impalpable; and by the trickery of cunning men may be so skillfully handled, altered, travestied, and perverted, as to escape the notice not only of the ignorant but even of the intelligent reader. Tertullian says that some heretics used the knife (*machæra*) in dealing with Scripture, while others more crafty made use of the pen (*stylus*). Here is what he says of the latter process: "Even when heresy admits the Holy Scriptures in their integrity, by devising meanings opposed to their true meaning it perverts them. For a forged sense is as contrary to truth as a forged text."<sup>2</sup>

And this, it need scarcely be added, was the most universally practiced form of opposing revealed Truth and eluding Church authority from the very beginning of the Christian religion. There is no opinion so absurd, Cicero used to say, that may not plead in its favor the authority of some philosopher. In the same way there was no form of religious error so senseless or shocking, that was not supported by texts of Scripture, adroitly explained by wicked men to suit their purpose. The Unity of God, The Divinity of Our Lord, the Trinity of Persons—all were denied and the denial sustained by appeals to the Written Word. In the

<sup>1</sup> Impius cum in profundum venerit, contemnit. Prov. xviii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> "Tantum veritati obstreperit adulter sensus quantum et corruptor stylus." De Præscr., cap. xvii.



Scripture, Manes found his impious Dualism, Valentinus his fanciful Æons, and the Gnostics their abominable doctrines, which no Christian can hear without shuddering. In the hands of those heretical jugglers, Scripture was a magical weapon which could be wielded at will, and could be used to defend to-day the doctrine which it would destroy to-morrow. With devilish ingenuity they managed even to draw from the holiest of books the praises of sin and impiety; and learned from its pages to make heroes and demigods out of Cain, the men of Sodom, and Judas Iscariot. And the Christian world of our day may well blush in seeing that the panegyrists of these reprobates of the Old and New Testaments have not died out with the Cajani or Cainists. For some of them have raised their voice, and been listened to without censure or reproof, in the Lutheran and Anglican Churches (so called) of modern times.

The Church is wise because she is taught of God, and designed by Him to be the salt of the earth. But even apart from the Holy Spirit of Truth, that perpetually dwells within her, nineteen centuries of existence in this wicked world have sufficiently schooled her in the ways of poor, erring humanity. *Nil admirari*, though formulated by a Pagan, is more of a Christian than a heathen maxim, and the Church has had its truth forced upon her by ages of experience. Hence, when she sees modern heretics walking in the footsteps of their predecessors and abusing Scripture as they did, she is not taken by surprise, even though she weep over the sacrilegious boldness that not only distorts the sense and spirit of God's Word, but presumes to mutilate or reject its letter and text. One heresy may differ from another in details; but the principle of heresy is always the same. In every place and in every age she despises Church authority. As to Scripture, she professes to hold it in reverence as the Word of God, but she will have it only on her own terms. She must make her own of it, assert her lordship over it, and use or misuse it as she will. She considers it her right to decide and dispose of it, as if it were her lawfully inherited possession, to declare how much of it she will renounce and how much she will retain; and of what she chooses to retain, the sense and meaning must be subject to her pleasure. This is not exactly the language she uses; but it is certainly what she does every day and has done from the beginning. And it is easier and safer to discover principles from habitual action than from mere written theories.

The heretics of to-day who owe their origin to Luther and Calvin, though constantly appealing to Scripture, have no more respect for it than had their predecessors, the early heretics. Like them, they will not let it stand in the way of their fancies, but will use either knife or pen (the *machæra* and *stylus* of Tertullian) as best

suits their purpose. It comes as easy to them to reject a book as to misinterpret a passage. And like the old heretics, they will allege critical or other grounds for cutting a book out of the sacred volume, but take good care to conceal their true reasons. Thus, to give an example, they will throw out the two books of Machabees, and give as ostensible cause that they are not found in Hebrew, and are not included in the Canon of Esdras. As if Esdras had received a commission from Heaven to seal hermetically the canon of inspired writings, or Almighty God had lost the right of inspiring His prophets and messengers through any other medium than the Hebrew tongue. They artfully kept back their true reason, which is, that the Catholic doctrine of praying for the dead is contained in the Machabees. They were too shortsighted to see that denying the canonicity of the book availed them nothing or very little; for the book is unquestionably (leaving out all question of inspiration) a true historical record, and the unchanging tradition of the Jews for twenty centuries proves that, even before the coming of Christ, while they were yet "the peculiar people" and Church of the true God, this was their doctrine, which could not have come to them unless through Divine revelation.

Luther did not formally, like Marcion, throw out of the canon any of the Evangelists, but he freely expressed his poor opinion (developed by his disciples into contempt and rejection) of some of them. He arrogantly compared the inspired historians of the new law with one another, and gave some the preference over others. Matthew, Mark, and Luke were not worthy to stand by the side of John or Paul, who give us Christ's words instead of his works. John's Gospel is the only nice and true chief Gospel, that is to be preferred and esteemed far, far beyond the other three Gospels. So too the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter far surpass the three Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.<sup>1</sup> In thus passing sentence

<sup>1</sup> "Johannis Evangelium ist das einige, Zarte, recht Håuptevangelion, und den andern dreien weit, weit furzuziehen und hoher zu heben. Also auch Sanet Paulus und Petrus Episteln weit uber die drei Evangelia Matthaci, Marci, und Lucå furgehen." These words appeared in the original Wittenberg edition of 1522, but were retrenched by the orthodox timidity of subsequent Lutheran editors. They again reappeared in the editions of Leipsic, Altenberg, and Halle. The last-mentioned edition was due to Walch, who was a zealous champion of Lutheranism, but a man of some honesty. In his edition of Luther's collected works (Luther's Sæmmtliche Schriften, Halle, 1740-50, twenty-four vols. in 4to) he has had the courage to reproduce not only the suppressed prefaces of the great reformer to the books of the New Testament, but also some passages, cancelled because unedifying, of his Haus-Postille. In the preface to the New Testament of 1522, from which we have already quoted, he further says, encouraging his readers to judge and discriminate as he himself did between the writers of the New Testament: "From all this, then (dear reader!), thou canst decide and distinguish *which are the best* of all these books. For John's Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles, especially the one to the Romans, and St. Peter's first Epistle, are the right kernel and marrow amongst all the books." This preface may be found in the Erlangen edition, published in our own day by Dr. Irmischer.

of depreciation upon writers inspired by the Holy Ghost, even though they are not swept out of the canon, have we not the root and germ of the broadest rationalism? But Luther was not content with half measures, disapproving of books and yet retaining them as canonical. Whenever it pleased him he went further and boldly pronounced that such or such a book was unworthy of the canon, and threw it out accordingly. This he did with St. James and the Apocalypse or Book of Revelations. Of the former he says: "I hold this for no apostle's work, and here is my reason. In direct contradiction to St. Paul and all other Scripture it allows justification to works. . . . In the second place it will teach Christians and yet never once mentions the passion, resurrection, and spirit of Christ. He (St. James) names Christ occasionally, yet teaches nothing of Him, talking only of ordinary belief in God. . . . And this is the true touchstone whereby to reprove all books, namely, by seeing whether they preach Christ or not, for all Scripture beareth witness to Christ (Rom. iii. 21), and St. Paul will know of nothing outside of Christ. (1 Cor. ii. 2.) Whatever does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though St. Peter or St. Paul should teach it. On the other hand, whatever preaches Christ would be apostolic, even if it came from Judas, Annas, Pilate or Herod. But this James does nothing more than urge the law and its works, etc."<sup>1</sup>

At the close of the same preface he gives his final decision. After saying that St. James wished to guard against those who relied on faith, without works, he goes on to say that he failed, for he had neither sufficient spirit, nor understanding, nor words, for the undertaking. "He tears the Scripture to pieces, and thus contradicts Paul and all Scripture. . . . Therefore I will not have him in my Bible, amongst the right, chief books. . . . One man is counted as no man in worldly affairs; how, then, can this one alone count anything against Paul and all the rest of Scripture?"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Ich achte sie für keines Apostels Schrift, und ist das meine Ursache. Auf's erste, dass sie stracks wider S. Paulum und alle andere Schrift den Werken die Gerechtigkeit gibt. . . . Auf's ander, dass sie will Christenleute lehren, und gedenke nicht einmal in solcher langer Lehre des Leidens, der Auferstehung, des Geistes Christi. Er nennet Christum etlich mal; aber er lehret nichts von ihm, sondern sagt von gemeinen Glauben an Gott . . . Auch ist das der rechte Prüffestein alle Bücher zu tadeln, wenn man siehet ob sie Christum treiben oder nicht, sintemal alle Schrift Christum zeigt (Rom. iii. 21) und S. Paulus nichts denn Christum wissen will (1 Kor. ii. 2). Was Christum nicht lehret, das ist noch nicht Apostolisch, wenns gleich S. Petrus oder Paulus lehrete. Wiederumb, was Christum prediget, das wäre Apostolisch, wenns gleich Judas, Hannas, Pilatus, und Herodes thät. Aber dieser Jacobus thut nicht mehr, denn treiben zu dem Gesetz und seinen Werken, u. s. w." *Luther's Works*, Erlangen ed. vol. lxxii. p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> Summa, er hat wollen denen wehren die auf den Glauben, ohn Werck, sich verliessen, und ist der Sach mit Geist, Verstand und Worten zu schwach gewesen, und

He expressed the same opinion, but in more jocular style, in his convivial hours. (See his *Tischreden*, printed at Frankfort, in 1567, fol. 494.)

This bold, undisguised utterance of Rationalism, the first, perhaps, ever heard in the modern world, was cautiously suppressed by his orthodox followers. But there it stands in the edition of 1522, and since the time of Walch no editor has ventured to conceal it. The Rationalists of our day have taken good care to parade it, as a testimony to the new exegesis from the highest authority. This has been done by De Wette, in his ter-centenary "*Worte Luther's*," and again by Bretschneider, in his "*Luther an unsere Zeit*." Nor was he less outspoken in his condemnation of the Apocalypse, rating it with the apocryphal Fourth Book of Esdras.

"I say what I feel. For more than one reason I hold it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic. First, and above all, the apostles do not deal in visions, but prophesy with plain, dry words. . . . Again, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, to say nothing of the New, who deals so thoroughly in visions and images, so that I almost hold it like the Fourth Book of Esdras and can find no trace that it comes from the Holy Ghost. . . . This book does not suit my spirit, and I have reason enough not to think highly of it, for in it Christ is neither taught nor recognized. To do this, however, is the first duty of an apostle, as He says, 'You shall be my witnesses' (Acts i. 8). Therefore, I hold to the books that give me Christ, clear and pure."<sup>1</sup> Luther afterwards became ashamed of this intemperate judgment, and did not wait for his disciples to piously remove out of sight this reckless effusion of their master. He suppressed it himself. And thus it is entitled in the Erlangen edition: "Preface to the Revelation of St. John, of the year 1522, suppressed by Luther in later editions of the New Testament." It would have been a sore loss to the non-Catholic world, had Luther succeeded in driving the apocalyptic Scarlet Woman, the Beast, and Antichrist out of the canon.

---

zereisset die Schrift, und widerstehet damit Paulo und aller Schrift. . . . DARUMB WILL ICH IHN NICHT HABEN IN MEINER BIBEL in der Zahl der rechten Häuptbücher. . . . Ein Mann ist kein Mann in weltlichen Sachen; wie sollt denn dieser einzeler nur allein wider Paulum und alle andere Schrift gelten? Ibid. p. 158, in note.

<sup>1</sup> Ich sage was ich fühle. Mir mangelt an diesem Buch nicht einerlei dass ichs widder apostolisch noch prophetische halte. Aufs erste und allermeist dass die Apostel nicht mit Gesichtern umgehen, sondern mit klaren und dorren Worten weissagen, . . . Auch so ist kein Prophet im Altem Testament, schweig im Neuen, der so gar durch und durch mit Gesichtern und Bilden handel, dass ichs fast gleich bei mir achte dem vierten Buch Esdras, und allerdinge nicht spuren kann, dass es von dem Heiligen Geist gestellet sei . . . mein Geist kann sich in das Buch nicht schicken, und ist mir die Ursach gnug, dass ich sein nicht hoch achte, dass Christus darinnen widder gelehret noch erkannt wird, welchs doch zu thun für allen Dingen ein Apostel schuldig ist, wie er sagt, (Acts i. 8.) Ihr sollt meine Zeuge sein. Darumb bleib ich bei den Büchern, die mir Christum hell und zein dargehen. (Ibid. p. 169, 170.)

Luther did not confine his lording it over Scripture to the books of James and John, nor, indeed, to the New Testament. Of St. Jude he says: "No one can deny that his epistle is an extract or copy of St. Peter's Second Epistle. . . . He alleges sayings and facts that are nowhere found in Scripture." He adds that it is an unnecessary epistle. (Ibid. p. 158.) According to Luther, the Epistle to the Hebrews is not of St. Paul nor of any apostle. It has knotty points in it that can scarcely be explained away. It has its mixture of wood, straw, and stubble. (Ibid. pp. 154, 155.) The Books of Kings are only Jewish Calendars, yet they are more trustworthy than the Chronicles! ("Darumb ist den Büchern der Könige mehr zu glauben, denn der Cronicken." Tischreden, Frankfurt, 1567, fol. 495.) The Book of Esther deserves more than any other to be put out of the canon. It Judaizes and contains a great deal of heathenish naughtiness. (Tischreden, fol. 494. *verso*, and Latin Works, Ed. of Erlangen, vol. vii. 195.) Job, Jonah, the Canticle, Isaiah, and the Prophets, did not escape his critical rod. But why continue the enumeration? Enough has been said to prove the utter want of reverence with which Luther felt himself privileged to speak and write of God's revealed Word.

The work begun by the Reformer of Wittemberg was taken up and pursued with ardor by his followers. The consequence is that scarcely one single book of the New Testament has escaped their destroying hands. Sieffert, Schultze, Schott, Fischer, De Wette, and Schneckenburger deny the authenticity of St. Matthew. Michaelis will not allow the canonicity of St. Mark and St. Luke. Schleiermacher thinks the Gospel of St. Luke to be the work of four different authors. Vogel, Horst, and Ballenstedt reject the Gospel of St. John. Baur denies the credibility of the Acts, and De Wette, bolder still, maintains that it betrays ignorance of Jewish manners, contains errors, and narrates miracles partly irrational, partly immoral. Semler and Eichhorn doubt the genuineness of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Mayerhoff pronounces spurious that to the Colossians. Schmidt and Kern have their doubts about the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. The three epistles to Timothy and Titus are repudiated by Schleiermacher, Schott, Baur, Mayerhoff and Schrader. Credner and Neudecker have spared the Epistle to Titus, but give up, as not genuine, the two addressed to Timothy.

The Catholic Epistles have fared worse and have been sacrificed each in its turn. Luther condemned that of St. James as "an epistle of straw," but his early followers restored it to the canon. Kern and De Wette have again displaced it. The First Epistle of St. Peter is rejected by Cludius, the Second by Semler, Schott, Guerriker, and others. The Second and Third Epistles of St. John

are condemned by Fritzche, Paulus, and Credner; and all three by Lange, Cludius and Bretschneider. The "unnecessary" Epistle of St. Jude is denied by Bolten, Dahl, and Bergen. Finally, the Apocalypse, in spite of all its good service against the Roman Antichrist, has been thrust aside, not only by Luther and Calvin, but also by some of their latest disciples,—Semler, Michaelis, De Wette, Bretschneider, and many others.<sup>1</sup>

The book at the head of this paper calls attention to another way in which heresy is wont to domineer over the Word of God, and irreverently trample it under foot. It is the way of translation; we mean wicked, deliberately unfaithful translation. This is one of the most artful ways of teaching religious error in God's name. It is more insidious and more fatal than mere comment for the unlettered and the unwary. The simple reader is ordinarily fonder of his privilege than the student; he uses no note or comment. But the comment is there unseen and does its work. It has been foisted adroitly into the text and makes a portion of it. This branch of our subject is too ample for the small space at our command. We shall return to it and point out some, not of the unimportant minutiae that need revision, but of the glaring errors of doctrinal sense introduced into the text under the cover of translation. Will these be corrected by the Committee of Revision? We have very little hope of it.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Rev. Mr. Dewar's *German Protestantism*: Oxford, 1844. To its pages we are principally indebted for the above catalogue of Lutheran theologians who study the Bible in order to overthrow its books, one by one. (See pp. 122, 133.)

## THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES IN THE RECENT TRANSLATION OF ALZOG.

*Manual of Church History.* By the Rev. Dr. John Alzog, Professor of Theology at the University of Freiberg. Translated, with additions, by F. J. Pabisch, D.D., President of the Provincial Seminary of Mt. St. Mary's of the West, and Rev. Thos. Byrne. In three volumes. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1878.

THE translation of Dr. Alzog's *Manual of Church History* is an important labor, giving, especially to the students in our ecclesiastical seminaries, a learned summary of ecclesiastical history, such as has not hitherto been accessible to English readers. The additions of the learned translators to the references of the author increase its value, as Dr. Alzog cites constantly articles in German periodicals that cannot easily be obtained in this country, and would be unreadable to many students. A reluctance to overload the work has, perhaps, prevented their carrying this out sufficiently, and references to sources more at the command of English-speaking students would greatly enhance the value of the work for practical purposes.

Leaving, however, this point to more competent critics, we must express surprise and regret at the portion devoted to the Catholic Church in the United States. To cite as authority an author like O'Kane Murray, who made no original research, and to whom a newspaper hoax or a magazine story is as authentic material for history as a missionary report to the Propaganda or the acts of a council, prepares the reader's mind for some strange results.

The subject of the Church in this country is not treated in any philosophical, systematic manner, so as to give the student a clear idea of the origin of the Church in the different parts of our territory, initiated under different national guidance, implanting the ecclesiastical law, ceremonies, festivals of several nations on our soil, to be blended at last into the Church as it is in our day.

In the Spanish portion we find the silly fable of Friar Juan Xuarez having been Bishop of Florida given as a fact, and the assertion made that he and his companions were the first missionaries to set foot on our territory. That Xuarez was a bishop is contradicted by every contemporaneous document, by the silence of all the Spanish writers, and by intrinsic facts. Under the bull of Pope Julius II., the Catholic king nominated bishops in the Indies, and, by Spanish regulations, those nominated wore some of the insignia of bishops, and enjoyed certain powers and privileges. They were constantly spoken of as bishops. But neither

Cabeza de Vaca, the historian of the expedition, nor any of the documents of the time, speak of Father Xuarez as any more than a commissary, and his portrait, preserved with those of the rest of the twelve pioneer Franciscans, gives him no attributes of the episcopal state. Barcia, historian of the Indies, who prepared his *Ensayo Cronologico* on Florida, under the name of Cardenas, giving ecclesiastical affairs careful notice, had evidently found no allusion to such a bishop or bishopric.

The pretended See would not be in Florida, but in Mexico, and, if it had been erected, would appear in the lists of Mexican Sees in the councils and elsewhere, but there is no trace of any such See. None of those who wrote of the bishops in Spanish America, like Gil Gonzales Davila, though they gathered up much that needed scrutiny, found any trace of such a See. Had the See been erected with jurisdiction over Florida, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction there would have naturally connected Florida with Mexico. Yet, in the voluminous controversy between the Franciscans of Florida and Juan Ferro Machado, the priest sent as his delegate by the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba, in which the very jurisdiction of the bishop is questioned, Father Ayeta never refers to any such Bishop of Florida, although the fact would have been a strong one in his favor if Florida had ever been formed into a distinct diocese; and this Father, examining all the records of his Order, would not be likely to overlook the argument that a son of St. Francis had actually been appointed.

The reference made to a modern French writer, who compiled without accurate guides, was the only authority for the fable, and so stated guardedly when first mentioned. The slightest examination would have shown those who have built on sand how worthless it was.

The origin of the Church in the Spanish portion is thus erroneous, and the noble Dominican, the first whose voice was raised in the Western World in the cause of human freedom, is denied his just honor of having been the first to rear a chapel on our soil for white and Indian.

For the French portion it is equally misleading. The See of Quebec is said to have been established in 1675, through the influence of Louis XIV. The influence was rather against it. The Archbishop of Rouen, who had exercised jurisdiction in this country, wished the new bishop to be one of his suffragans, and the King, anxious to make another court bishop of the stamp of the Four Articles, delayed the matter for years, so that Clement X. was surely not strongly influenced by Louis XIV., when he made Quebec an Episcopal See by his bull of October 1st, 1674, dependent immediately on the Holy See, putting an end to the influence



of the Archbishop of Rouen, and all hope of planting Gallicanism in Canada.

The position of the Catholics in the English colonies is more important, as out of their feeble Church grew in time the See of Baltimore, and the many of which it has been the fruitful parent.

We are astonished to be told of these colonial Catholics that, "during the war of Independence they were placed under the jurisdiction of the Apostolic Vicariate of London." This leaves the Catholics from the time of the settlement of Maryland to the American Revolution under no episcopal supervision. Yet it is very certain that the Vicar Apostolic, the Chapter during the vacancy, and finally the Vicars Apostolic of London, from the time of James II., did exercise authority over the Maryland Catholics. The ordinance of Bishop Bonaventure Gifford, regulating the holidays of obligation in this country, would alone suffice to show that their authority was recognized and was exercised. The missionaries (except during a brief period of a secular mission under the authority of the Propaganda) were English Jesuits and Franciscans; and as all regulars in England, by the decision of the Holy See, had to obtain faculties from the Vicars Apostolic, those who came over, came with such faculties, and were subject to a Vicar-General in this country. So far from it being a fact that the Revolution was the time when the Catholics in the colonies were placed under the care of the Vicar Apostolic of London, it was just the time when the intercourse, a century old, was broken off. "There was but little communication between the Catholics of America," says Bishop Carroll, "and their bishop, the Vicar Apostolic of the district of London, on whose spiritual jurisdiction they were dependent. But whether he did not wish to have any relation to a people whom he regarded in the light of rebels, or whether it was owing, says my old MS., to the natural apathy of his disposition, it is certain that he had hardly any communication either with the priests or the laity on this side of the Atlantic. Anterior to the Declaration of Independence he had appointed the Rev. Dr. Lewis his vicar; and it was this gentleman who governed the mission of America during the time that the bishop remained inactive."

We are next told that Pius VII., by brief of April 8th, 1808, made New Orleans a suffragan of Baltimore. New Orleans was not even a See. The diocese of Louisiana, established in 1793, embraced the portion of the old diocese of Santiago de Cuba, which was on the mainland, and had been directed by an auxiliar. Like Santiago and its other division, San Cristobal, it was a suffragan of Saint Domingo. When Baltimore was made a metropolitan See, four new Sees, erected within the limits of the old diocese of Baltimore, were made suffragans, but there is no allusion to Louisiana. That bishopric was va-

cant, and the future appointment a matter of great delicacy and difficulty. The Holy See sought a way out of the labyrinth, not an increase of obstacles. It made Louisiana immediately subject to Rome. When the first Provincial Council of Baltimore convened in 1829, it is noted expressly, after stating that Archbishop Whitfield convoked it: "Revum quoque Episcopum Sancti Ludovici, Neo Aureliæ administratorem, S. Sedi immediate subjectum, eo quod dioceses quibus præest intra Fœderatæ Americæ limites sitæ sint, invitavit, ut, salvis ceteroquin suis privilegiis, Concilio interesset." Even when the acts of the council went to Rome, no one seemed aware that a brief of Pius VII. made New Orleans a suffragan of Baltimore, whose bishop might be summoned in the usual way; and if the brief was unknown in Baltimore, New Orleans, and Rome, we may well doubt its existence.

In regard to religious orders, the confusion is equally strange. Speaking of the Society of Jesus, this work says: "After its suppression, Charles Carroll and six companions, who arrived from Europe at the opening of the present century, perpetuated its traditions in the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, under the direction of the Rev. Robert Molyneux, which they entered May 10th, 1805."

Who was this Father Charles Carroll, whom it took more than a quarter of a century after the suppression to cross the Atlantic to America? We confess most absolute ingorance of any such Father. We do not find him in Oliver or in the Maryland lists. It cannot be a mistake for John Carroll, who certainly did not arrive at the opening of the present century, having been then for years the honored bishop of Baltimore. How this mythical Father, who came only about 1800, was required to perpetuate the traditions of the old society, when the members in Maryland and Pennsylvania had formed a kind of association for that purpose, is not very evident.

But that they or any other priests organized the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus in this country is something new, and will be so to the members of the Society of Jesus. There is no trace of any intercourse between the Fathers of the Sacred Heart and the ex-Jesuits of the English province. Father Paccanari endeavored to induce those in England to enter this Society of the Faith of Jesus, but letters from members of the old society, to the brethren in America, show that they declined chiefly on account of the fourth vow, which would require them to defend orally and in writing the "Brief of the Suppression," whereas they considered their absolute obedience to it all that was demanded. Repulsed in England, the Fathers of the Faith made no attempt to win the few ex-Jesuits here.

Gradually the Fathers of the Faith and of the Sacred Heart

began to join the organization, which had been maintained intact in Russia, and which was simply an unsuppressed portion of the Society of Jesus. The Holy See permitted this without any definite sanction. The ex-Jesuits in America began to seek a reunion with that branch of the old Society. Rome gave an oral consent, and the Maryland Fathers wished to act upon it, but Bishop Carroll advised delay. He thought a *vivæ vocis oraculum* a very unsafe dependence, as in case of the death of Pius VII., a successor not friendly to the Order might arraign them as rebels, who, after submitting to the brief of Clement XIV., resumed their habit, vows, and life in defiance of it, and the difficulty of proving canonically the *oraculum* would be fatal. But they persevered, and it was the Society of Jesus that they re-entered, Father Molyneux being appointed Superior by Father-General Gruber.

Coming to less important matters, such as the sketch of Catholic periodicals, it is not easy to see why, if the *American Celt* and *Irish World* are to be noted as Catholic papers, the *Shamrock*, edited by Thomas O'Connor, is not placed at the head of all, and the *Green Banner*, edited by the Rev. Thomas S. Levins, and the original *Metropolitan Magazine*, not deemed worthy of mention, the latter as our first attempt at a monthly.

We need not dwell on minor errors, calling Father Serra an Italian; placing Segura's mission in Maryland; making missionaries from the seminary at Douay co-operate with the Jesuits in the Indian missions in Maryland; making a mission on Neutral Island, "whence it was removed to Mount Desert Island;" sending Hennepin to the mouth of the Mississippi; making Bishop England, recently arrived in this country when made bishop, etc.

The able translators are scarcely pardonable for so sorry an account of the Church in this country, as they so recently had residing in their seminary the Rev. J. M. Finotti, than whom there are few in the country better versed in the past, and whose collection of books and material for a history of the Church in the United States, can scarcely be equalled.

The extent of historical research and study in the various States, and the familiarity of many Protestant students even, with our earlier annals, makes it essential that in a work of this standard, this portion should be above criticism, either in conception or execution.

Before too many copies are printed this portion needs a thorough re-casting, if not re-writing, for it is not what should be placed in the hands of students as a guide in the seminaries in this country; and in those of England and Ireland, where the translation will be welcomed, it will be a national shame to have such a summary placed as our own account of our own history.

CATHOLICITY AND PROTESTANTISM IN RELATION  
TO OUR FUTURE AS A PEOPLE.

UNTIL a few years past the people of the United States looked forward to the future with a strong and general conviction that a glorious destiny awaited them. We believed that our material resources would insure, in their development, universal plenty and comfort. The ease with which remunerative employment could be obtained, and the abundance and cheapness of the necessities of life kept off the debasing influences which tend powerfully to demoralize the lower classes in Europe. The absence of overgrown fortunes, the prevalent simplicity of life, and our youthful vigor preserved us, for the time being, from the vices and corruption which attend luxury.

We congratulated ourselves on having the best government in the world. Whence our political constitutions and the principles that underlaid them had been derived, were questions about which we were but little concerned. It was a popular notion that they had been evolved from the brains of our forefathers in the times that immediately preceded our successful struggle with Great Britain for national independence.

In accordance with this notion, flattering to our pride and widely current, though it needs no profound acquaintance with history to prove it a sheer delusion, demagogues and newspapers constantly repeated that our government was an experiment which no other people had ever been sagacious enough and good enough to attempt, or, if they had, had not been equal to the task of conducting it to a happy issue. The conditions essential to success on our part were with almost universal assent proclaimed to be intelligence and virtue, both of which it was assumed we possessed in eminent degree, and both of which, it was confidently believed, we would ever continue to possess.

There seemed, too, no limits to our power of assimilating to ourselves the emigrants who were flocking to our shores. They came by hundreds of thousands; they were merged at once into the body of the people of the United States, and their children were undistinguishable from those who traced back their descent to colonial ancestors, unless in the manifestation of even greater energy and a stronger desire to improve their fortunes and advance in social position. From this intermingling of the blood of Celt and Saxon, Teuton and Scandinavian, the inhabitants of the United States, it was confidently predicted, would combine the highest and noblest natural elements of all those races, and uniting them into

a homogeneous whole would grow up into a people superior in physical, intellectual, and moral endowments to any other nation or race on the face of the earth. As regards energy, industry, intelligence, virtue, civil equality, personal freedom, good order and peace in society, general comfort, contentment and good will between different classes, general refinement, purity of morals, respect for law, reverence for religion, and all the elements, conditions, and characteristics of the highest civilization, it was believed that we would become an example and a model to all other peoples.

But of late the people of the United States have become less sanguine as to their future, and they are now by no means as confident of a happy and glorious destiny as they were thirty years ago. Apprehensions are entertained not merely by a few persons, here and there, of more thoughtful and penetrating minds, or of more gloomy temperament, according to the judgment that may be passed upon them, but there is a very general foreboding of evil, which finds expression in various forms and takes to itself different shapes according to the characters and thoughts of those who entertain it, and which evinces almost universal doubt and fear as to our future conditions.

It is not our intention to analyze this feeling, and attempt to resolve it into its constituent elements, nor to follow it out in the different directions it takes referring to our political, our social, our moral, or our religious future ; the fact that such a feeling of doubt and uncertainty exists is undeniable. It finds expression in newspapers and pamphlets, in popular harangues, in public lectures, as well as in pulpit discourses and thoughtful essays. It has its ground, unquestionably, in the conviction that, though our material resources are undiminished, those resources no longer avail to furnish means for comfortable support to the whole body of the people ; that deep and bitter social antagonisms are plainly manifesting their existence among us ; that principles which hitherto have been regarded as political axioms, forming the permanent foundation of civil freedom and good government, are now doubted or denied ; that there is widespread skepticism as to the very existence among us, as actual realities, of public and private virtue ; that the majesty of law, far from being revered as sacred and inviolable, is sneered at, and its highest sanctions resolved into brute force, or the craft of politicians, or, at best, into the arbitrary determination of a mere majority of individuals ; that the bond of matrimony is no longer regarded as indissoluble ; that the relations of husband and wife and parents and children are not revered as resting on divine sanctions, but looked upon as deriving their whole significance from mere natural affection or civil enactments ; that morality has no other basis than the conventionalities of society or the power

of public opinion ; and that religion itself is only a respectable name for superstition, having its origin in certain natural emotions, and having no other value than what resides in its ability to gratify those emotions.

Must we, then, despair of our future ? Is there not ground for hope that we will eventually attain the exalted destiny which Providence seems to have plainly marked out for us. We firmly believe there is ; but our trust and confidence is based on grounds entirely different from those of non-Catholic writers. The reasons they generally give for the hope to which they cling are various, but they are all, it seems to us, equally fallacious.

1. Much stress is laid upon a certain conservative power which is supposed to reside in the people as a body, which allows moral disease to run its course, corrupting the body, politic and social, and bringing it almost to the point of dissolution ; but then, when the disease has reached its crisis, this conservative power, it is expected, will summon up the vital energies of the nation, and enable it to rise up from its almost fatal sickness, not only convalescent, but purified, invigorated, regenerated.

There is a modicum of truth in this, as there is in the same theory in regard to the body of an individual. As long as the vital powers are sufficiently vigorous to overcome the disease and rally from its effects, such a reaction is possible. But where this is not the case, where the disease has become too deeply seated, the blood poisoned, the physical constitution impaired, and the vital organs no longer able to perform their normal functions, collapse ensues from which there is no reaction, and the result is death.

2. Another favorite idea, particularly of the last generation, is that virtue and intelligence in the people are sure guarantees of peace and good order in society, of the perpetuity of political institutions such as we possess, of personal civil equality and freedom, and of continued material prosperity and progress in civilization.

But have we, as a people, actually and in fact, these guarantees ? And, if we have, is there just reason to expect that we will continue to possess them ? Whatever power they have resides, too, in their union. The existence of the one without that of the other, we need scarcely say, will be ineffectual. It surely requires no long argument to prove that a certain degree of intelligence is necessary to the existence of virtue in positive, effective form. On the other hand, mere intelligence by no means implies virtue as an inseparable concomitant, or as a necessary consequence. Some of the greatest monsters that have lived on earth, some of the very worst men that have ever cursed society, were men of great intelligence, possessed of keen perceptions, of thoroughly trained minds, of great knowledge. It is too late in the life of mankind to pretend,

in the face of all the lessons of history, that mere knowledge of right and wrong is necessarily accompanied with, or productive of, the will to abstain from wrong and do what is right. The names of Nero, Henry IV. and Frederick Barbarossa of Germany, of Voltaire, Rousseau, Mirabeau, Mazzini, and a host of others, come to mind as examples of the truth of what we have just said. Three-fourths of the criminals in our public prisons have been fairly educated, so far as mere mental training goes, and if all who violated the law, penal and moral, had their deserts, the proportion of *intelligent* and highly "educated," cultivated, refined convicts would be vastly greater. The greatest criminals of our times, those who without the excuse of sudden temptation, of pinching poverty, and actual destitution, have coolly, deliberately, systematically broken over all the restraints of honor and honesty, and carried distress through their wholesale frauds, and robberies, and forgeries, into thousands of families, have generally been highly "educated" men, men of intelligence, refinement, culture.

It is the merest cant therefore to talk about intelligence alone being any safeguard against corruption, which, once it finds lodgment in the heart of a people, saps their strength, perverts the action of every department of government, no matter what its outward form may be, renders every civil institution by which the principles of freedom are attempted to be preserved, ineffective and makes utterly futile for promoting national progress and prosperity the richest and most varied material resources. It is not worth while to argue the point. With all the systematic persistent efforts to ignore the fact and put it out of view, the common sense of mankind, and the universal tradition of truth first revealed to man, and however obscured still existing everywhere, compel the admission that intelligence without virtue is no safeguard against that perversion of will, that course of demoralization which, in nations as well as individuals, insures their decadence and their eventual ruin.

Along with knowledge of the truth, with the intelligent perception of what is right and good, must be conjoined virtue, the actual doing of the right and good. For virtue is not an empty name, nor is it a mere refinement. It rests on positive principles, from which it derives all its value, strength, and reality. Those principles we need not say have their source and origin in religion. From it they derive all their power.

This is an axiomatic truth. Even those who deny it, and endeavor to construct a theory of virtue which will exclude religion, are always compelled, consciously or unconsciously, to fall back upon religion, in one way or another, in order to find a foundation for their theories. Even while with loud professions of scorn, they speak of religion as a delusion, a baseless fabric of disordered fancy,

they are compelled to make it by implication the foundation-stone, the very centre and ground principle of all their theories.

Pantheism, which denies all personal existence to God, and resolves Him into a mere aggregate of natural powers, has its religions. There is even a religion of Atheism. And the modern phases of that system of utter doubt, which denies the possibility of certainly knowing anything about God and his existence or non-existence, has its religion of "the unknowable." Whatever of truth, therefore, there is, amid all the prevailing confusion of thought, in the popular theory of the conservative power of intelligence and virtue, it falls back necessarily upon religion for support.

Nor can there be question or doubt as to what religion we must depend upon, to make and keep the people of the United States virtuous. However the prevailing skepticism of the age may magnify and extol ideas which they find, or imagine they find, in ancient heathen religions, those for example of the Persians, the Hindoos, and Chinese, however carefully they may keep in the background the fact that whatever of truth these religions embodied has never actualized itself in an effective practical way among those people—even if this be put out of view, in reference to heathen systems of religion, the history of the world sets forth the fact too plainly to be ignored or denied, that no other religion than Christianity (and its type and predecessor, Judaism) has ever been a living power to enlighten, purify, and elevate the body of the people. It is not necessary to dwell on this. It is, or at least until a few years back was, almost universally admitted by the people of the United States. Our political institutions, our organic laws, our whole system of legislation imply it. Christianity, according to the decisions of our Supreme Courts, State and Federal, is part of the common law. The fact that there are now those who can openly question and deny the necessity of Christianity as a power to preserve within us, as a people, the conditions and elements of true national prosperity, and yet can escape universal detestation and reprobation, serves to show how far we have receded from that reverential belief in the Christian religion, which until recently we prided ourselves upon as a distinguishing national characteristic, and how rapidly and how far we have slid down into skepticism and irreligion, which even among the heathen have always been recognized as sure evidences of decay in manly vigor and intellectual and moral strength.

We assume, therefore, that Christianity is the only power which can prevent our decline, as regards all the elements required to make a people truly great and noble. But there are two forms of Christianity which claim acceptance, Protestantism and Catholicity. It is entirely aside from our purpose to discuss these with reference



to their respective doctrines, or to inquire which of them is the embodiment and teacher of that revelation of truth which was made by our Saviour. We propose only to consider their respective ability to fulfil those functions which religion must fulfil, or else the process of decadence in morals and in all the elements of national greatness will go on unchecked and render it impossible for us as a people to attain the exalted position to which, as we have hoped and believed, we were destined in the ordering of Divine Providence.

1. The first ground for questioning the ability of Protestantism to do this work, is that it presents no positive religious truths for acceptance. Certain of its sects, it is true, have certain formulas of doctrine embodied in their respective so-called confessions of faith; but, in the first place, these are matters of controversy, even between the different Protestant sects; and, in the second place, they are not put forth in any instance whatever as infallibly true, and as challenging assent on the basis of divine authority. Consequently it is impossible that they should exert any controlling influence even over the members of the sects who professedly believe them, much less over the people of the United States as a whole. At best they are mere opinions resting on no broader or firmer basis than the judgment of the individuals who entertain them. It is scarcely necessary, therefore, to say, that they are utterly deficient in that supreme power of control which Christian faith possesses and exerts. A religion with no dogmas authoritatively challenging belief on the ground that they are absolutely and infallibly true, a creedless religion (and this is what Protestantism not only now acknowledges but boasts itself to be) is a self-contradiction, a moral nonentity. It has no authority to teach definite positive truths; no power, therefore, to direct the conscience.

2. We take up, as our next point, the relations comprehended in the family. These relations rest upon divine sanctions. They are divine in their origin; the observance of the obligations comprehended in them is enjoined by express commandment of God; they are so perfectly adapted to the nature of man to his personal needs and wants, and to the relations in which he stands to society at large, that strict regard for these relations and for the rights and duties growing out of them has been universally considered, even among semi-barbarous peoples, indispensable conditions to individual welfare and national prosperity. It is an acknowledged standard for measuring public and private morality. What, now, can Protestantism do, what is Protestantism doing to promote reverence for the family relations, and belief in their divine origin and sanctity?

In answer to this question we take up the marriage relation out

of which the family grows. History tells us what Protestantism at its outset did in weakening in the minds of those over whom it obtained sway, belief in the indissolubility of the marriage bond, and belief in marriage itself as a divine institution. The record of the bigamy of Philip, the Prince of Hesse, a leading adherent and protector of Protestantism, which bigamy was allowed and sanctioned in writing by Luther, and his fellow "Reformers," is a well-known and significant page in the chronicles of the sixteenth century, though no more significant than many others of like import that might be cited. The repeated divorces and remarriages of Henry VIII., the head of the Reformation in England, form a whole chapter in the history of that country. It is well known that under the influence of the Reformation marriage, the solemnization of which as a sacrament had been entirely in the hands of the Church, was looked upon as merely a civil contract, and that some Protestant sects made it a part of their religion, to contract marriages only before a civil magistrate. The sense of anything sacramental in the marriage ceremonial has become so weak among Protestants that as regards any practical importance it has, it might as well not exist. The civil law has come to be looked upon as the foundation on which the marriage relation rests, as the source whence it derives its validity and as the expounder of its obligations and duties.

There are, it is true, in the disciplinary codes of some of the Protestant sects, declarations recognizing the divine character of the marriage relation, providing for its solemnization by ministers, forbidding marriage within certain degrees of consanguinity, and prohibiting a second marriage to persons who have husbands or wives living, from whom they have been divorced by decrees of civil magistrates. But these declarations and prohibitions are for all practical purposes, obsolete and dead. There is no practical enforcement of them. There is not a sect, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, or Calvinistic, with all their countless subdivisions, that has not scores and hundreds of persons in "good standing" in their "churches," who have been divorced by the civil law and yet have married again, though the divorced wife or husband is still living. Such instances can be found, too, among even the ministers of the different Protestant sects. Whatever, therefore, the printed declarations in the formulas of belief and books of discipline of Protestant sects may profess or prohibit, they all follow, in actual practice, the enactments of the civil law and the decisions of our courts.

The conclusion then is irresistible that it is utterly futile to look to Protestantism to effectively restrain much less to extirpate the loose and atheistical ideas which have come to prevail so widely

among the people of the United States in regard to the marriage relation.

What we have just said of the relation between husband and wife, is equally true as regards the relation of parents and children. While Protestantism theoretically holds that this relation is of divine origin, and that the rights and duties flowing from it are of divine obligation, it practically makes them to rest simply on natural law, and on legislative enactments defined and enforced by our civil courts. The rights of parents over their children, as regards education, have all been virtually surrendered and abnegated by Protestant sects to the State. For the definition of parental rights and duties, Protestantism, in practice, now looks not to divine revelation expounded in any authoritative way, but to the civil law. It practically follows the decisions of civil tribunals.

3. If we turn to the matter of personal integrity and honesty, both in public and in private life, we find that the influence of Protestantism, as a religious system, amounts practically to nothing in the way of restraint or purification. We make here no sweeping charges as to the personal characters of Protestants. It is not with individuals we are dealing, but with Protestantism in its practical action as a system. By its fundamental principle, it relegates to every individual the right of solving questions of conscience, of determining for himself what is honest and what is dishonest. If an individual, under the influence of subtle temptations, under circumstances where the judgment is clouded, and the line between honesty and dishonesty becomes faint and difficult to be clearly perceived, steps over to the side of dishonesty, there is no authoritative tribunal in Protestantism to teach him his error, to point out to him his sin, and declare with unmistakable certainty what he must do to relieve himself of guilt. He may go on in a constant repetition of dishonest acts, maintaining his position as a member of the sect to which he adheres, without restraint except such restraint as his own individual conscience may exercise, until public exposure overtakes him; and then if any disciplinary action is taken, it is in the form of ejection from the sect of which he was an adherent, the prime motive of which is the relieving of the sect itself from odium and discredit, not the deliverance of the ejected member from his sin.

4. Another point at which the inefficiency of Protestantism as a corrective and conservative power plainly shows itself is its inability to soften and break down the existing antagonisms in society, which are daily becoming deeper and more pronounced. Its inability to reach the poor, to exert any reformatory influence over the vicious, the criminal classes, the outcasts of society, its matter of constant lamentation on the part of thoughtful Prot-

estant ministers. Scarcely a convention, or convocation or conference of any Protestant sect is held but the subject comes up; and, in the discussion which ensues, the fact is brought plainly to light that whatever hold Protestantism may have upon the higher and middle classes of society, it has none whatever upon the lower.

How utterly irreconcilable this fact is with the claim of Protestantism to be *par excellence* Christianity, is aside from the purpose of this paper to show. We bring it up here simply in its relation to the subject of national prosperity. Protestantism does not, cannot, reach the poor. Consequently Protestantism does not, and cannot, check the socialistic tendency, the spirit of radical revolution which is spreading with fearful rapidity, and which, if it once gains the ascendancy, will repeat in this country, under conditions that will make them far more terrible than the social convulsions which, from time to time, threatened the very existence of Christian society in the Old World. Protestantism can do nothing, does nothing for the outcast, the vicious, the destitute classes of society. We do not wish to be misunderstood. We are not accusing individual Protestants of having no natural feelings of humanity. It is Protestantism as a system that we are discussing. There are many noble examples of generosity among Protestants, but in that respect they differ in no way from men who are kind and generous, though they believe in and profess no religion. They are generous, not because they are Protestants, but because they are naturally kind-hearted and humane.

We have said that Protestantism has no power over the poor, in preventing on their part the growth of feelings of jealousy, envy, and hatred of the wealthy, which threaten the peace and good order of society. So, too, it is wanting in real effective power over the rich. It can speak with no authority to them with respect to their obligations to "consider the poor." From regard to its fundamental principle that the individual judgment is the interpreter of divine revelation, it must leave to the individual conscience of the wealthy of its "churches" what each one will do, and what he will not do, in regard to works of benevolence; and, as a matter of actual fact, the benevolent wealthy among Protestants do not exercise their benevolence as a religious duty but as an act of humanity. What they do in this way is usually and to the greatest extent done in a purely humanitarian way. Protestantism, too, expressly denies the doctrine that there is any merit in good works, personal mortification, and self-denial. It thus takes from its adherents one of the strongest motives to acts of charity. Finally, on this point, in virtue of its principle of individual judgment as to religious obligations and duties, it makes

itself a principle of separation and division among men instead of a bond of union. However much it may speak in words about the brotherhood of men, it turns that truth in fact into a mere sentiment, and leaves to each individual to make out of it whatever he pleases, much or little. Thus Protestantism has no real power to restrain in the wealthy the inordinate desire for riches, the growth of luxury and self-indulgence, of indifference for and contempt of those who are socially beneath them.

It is evident, therefore, that we cannot look to Protestantism to check the growing tendency to socialism in our midst nor any of the evils to which it gives rise. In fact Protestantism is itself socialistic in principle. Its treatment of the poor is at bottom socialistic. It seeks to solve the problems of the different conditions of persons in society by the action of civil laws, and not of Christian charity. It depends upon poor laws, laws for the suppression of mendicancy, poorhouses, and workhouses, the raising of money by poor-rates and its distribution by public officials, overseers of the poor. Wherever Protestantism shapes the policy of a country and forms the ideas of the people, the poor have come to be looked upon as criminals, and practically they are often treated with less consideration.

5. Protestantism cannot be relied on as a corrective of the growing disregard for the sanctity of law. We are not referring here to outward violations of law in the form of criminal acts, but to the growing disbelief in the objective authority of law, as such. The Christian idea of law is that its authority is divine. It has its source in God, the source of all authority, secular or spiritual. Government is the embodiment of this authority as regards the relations of men in society. In republican governments this authority comes from God to the officers of the government mediately through the people. Its source is not in the people, but in God. The people do not create it; they receive it from God, and delegate it to those whom they appoint as legislators, to embody it in legislative enactments; as judges to interpret it and apply it practically to the facts and occurrences which fall within its scope; and as administrative officers, to give practical effect to its provisions. These officers are responsible to the people for the manner in which they discharge their trust, but they are responsible to them, not as the original fountain or source of law or as the creators of its authority, but as the stewards of God, who is the source of all law, of all right, of all obligation, and of all authority.

This is the only Christian idea of government. On any other ground law is nothing else than tyranny, and its resistance by one individual, or by a thousand, is no crime, properly speaking. It carries with it no moral culpability; it is not a sin. On any other

ground except that of the divine origin and authority of law, legal punishments are nothing more than the expressions of the will of the greater number, or the more powerful body, of persons in a community, and have no moral character whatever. Accordingly there is no moral obligation on the part of the individual to submit to punishment. If he does submit, it is simply because superior force requires submission.

We need not say that these ideas of government, and of civil authority, are simply anarchical. They justify revolutions, conspiracies, combinations to set law at defiance, wherever a number of individuals choose to oppose themselves to civil authority. Yet these are just the ideas that are widely prevalent in our midst, and there is nothing in Protestantism to resist or prevent their spread. In fact, Protestantism practically favors them. Its fundamental principle, in constituting the individual judgment the supreme arbiter and determiner of right and wrong, justifies them.

We do not forget that Protestantism refuses to accept this statement as correct, and endeavors to evade its point by declaring that it does not make the individual's judgment, but the Bible, the determiner of right and wrong. But, after all, it is the Bible, as interpreted by the individual judgment, and thus the question of what the Bible means and teaches, is relegated to the individual judgment, and the individual judgment becomes in actual fact, in Protestantism, the supreme judge, the final tribunal, in the decision of every case.

The traditional belief, too, in the sacred Scriptures as the written word of God, which Protestantism inherited from the Catholic Church, has been so weakened, particularly of late years, that even the reverence professed by Protestants for the Bible, and which still occupies so prominent a place in their various printed creeds, is fast dying out. The assertions and doubts among them as to the inspiration of the Scriptures; as to what parts of them are to be accepted as authentic, and what shall be rejected as spurious; what renderings in their King James's version are erroneous; whether the Greek text from which the translation was made, was not imperfect and corrupt; and what changes should be made both in it and the popular English version,—these and kindred questions which, according to the fundamental principle of Protestantism can only be solved by a process of human criticism, and about which every one is free to adopt whatever opinion he chooses, have almost destroyed the traditional convictions of Protestants in the Bible as a record of divinely revealed truth.

Without entering further into the subject, we are justified in concluding from our discussion of the five points stated, that Protestantism cannot exert the restraining, corrective, and conservative

influence necessary to check, much less to extirpate the growing immorality, irreligion, lawlessness, and open defiant denial of legitimate authority, both in Church and State, which if allowed to go on will destroy all possibility of our reaching the exalted position among the nations of the world which, until recently, we regarded as our certain destiny. Were Protestantism, therefore, the only form of Christianity existing in our midst, the people of the United States would be compelled to look forward to their national and social future with most gloomy forebodings, if not with despair.

But the Catholic religion challenges our acceptance as the religion of Christ, and its claims are acknowledged by a large portion of the people of the United States. It is in place therefore to consider the influence of Catholicity with reference to the same points by which we tested Protestantism.

1. The first objection we made to Protestantism was that it had no fixed positive truths authoritatively challenging belief. The contrast here between it and the Catholic religion is broad and obvious. The Catholic religion comes forward in no timid hesitating way, as though doubtful of the validity of its own claims to be heard. There is no uncertainty as to its requirements and demands. Its dogmas are definite, precise, and distinct; the doctrines it teaches are not put forth as opinions resting on human judgment, but as the truth of God, having God for their author, revealed by Him, and committed by Him to the Church to teach with authority, and with the absolute, infallible certainty, which divinely given authority implies.

There is no room, therefore, for vacillation or uncertainty on the part of any one who accepts the Catholic religion as to what the doctrines of Christianity are, or what are the principles by which his conduct should be regulated. He may not always be controlled by those principles, he may not live up to his known obligations, but there is not the slightest uncertainty as to what those obligations are. His convictions are not based upon his own subjective feelings and opinions, they ground themselves on the authority of the Church to teach and guide him, and on the infallibility with which she has been invested in order that she may fulfil her teaching function, and thus secure, not frustrate, the purpose for which it was given.

It is evident, therefore, that the influence of the Catholic Church (without regard now to the moral character of that influence), upon those whom that influence controls, is definite, positive, and authoritative. Indeed her enemies charge this upon her, as a ground of objection and opposition.

2. We showed the want of restraining, correcting, and controlling power in Protestantism, as regards the family relations. Let

us now examine Catholicity with reference to the same point. The Catholic Church teaches that marriage is a sacrament, that the relation is of perpetual obligation; that it is God who joins together husband and wife, and that no human power can dissolve the union; that though the State assumes that it may decree divorces, it is an act of usurpation, and that such decrees are invalid in conscience and in the sight of God.

Departure from this principle of the indissolubility of the marriage relation is always fraught with evil. It is acknowledged to be so, even by those who deny that marriage is indissoluble. Our legislatures and courts discourage divorces, because of their pernicious effects upon public morality.

We cannot enter here into details to show how the Catholic doctrine of marriage practically operates in preventing the immoralities which grow out of looser and lower ideas. It is universally felt that it does. Every husband and wife married to a Catholic knows that his or her partner in marriage will never seek a divorce, unless he becomes utterly reprobate in conscience, and an apostate to his religion.

The very different manner, too, in which the passion of love is treated by the Catholic Church, from that in which it is practically regarded outside the Church, contributes most powerfully to preserve those who accept her teaching from sins of impurity. There is no deification of the mere passion of human love, no recognition of the popular idea that its very violence will excuse indulgence, if not, indeed, sanctify it. On the contrary, it is to be ever held in check, and kept in constant subjection. Love for God is the only affection that can be allowed unlimited sway in the human heart, and all other feelings and affections, from whatever source they spring, and towards whatever object they tend, must be held entirely subordinate to the honor and glory of God, to whom all thoughts, feelings, desires, and emotions must be directed as their last end.

Then, too, another sacrament, that of penance, or as it is commonly called confession, comes in to exert a most effective specific influence and constant restraint from sins involving violations of the sixth commandment (or, as Protestants enumerate it, the seventh). The seeds of conjugal infidelity and of impurity under every form, are nipped in the bud. They cannot find lodgment in the mind of a Catholic who regularly attends to his religious duties, as unconscious thoughts and desires, unrecognized until, growing through indulgence, they take the form of immoral actions, open or secret. The examination of conscience, which forms a part of the daily devotions of pious Catholics, and always precedes confession, brings them to light, puts the person who is tempted by impure thoughts, upon his guard, making him conscious of the



necessity of constant vigilance against the very beginnings of evil and of keeping his heart pure. If sinful desires obtain entrance and finally overpower him, and his sin takes the form of a positive act, it is because he has not been vigilant and faithful, and not because of any uncertainty as to the moral character of the act. He knows that he is violating a commandment of God, and is acting in direct violation of his religious obligations.

How powerfully the influence which the Church thus exerts through her doctrine and sacraments, promotes purity of morals, is manifest. It is felt and acknowledged, almost universally indeed, by non-Catholics as well as by Catholics. Attempts are sometimes made by Protestants in the heat of controversy, and led away by passion and prejudice, to gloss over the truth and misrepresent facts bearing on this subject, but the superiority of the services rendered to society by the Catholic religion in the exaltation of woman from the inferior position she occupied in all nations before the establishment of the Church, to her proper place in the family, and in preserving purity of morals as regards the marriage and family relations, cannot be hidden.

It needs only to consult the records of our courts in regard to applications for divorces, proceedings for abortion, and for violations of the marriage relation, for desertion, and for bigamy, and like criminal acts, to convince every one who is open to conviction, of the vast difference between Protestantism and Catholicity in this respect. The files of our daily newspapers in their reportorial columns furnish like evidence. So, too, the reports of medical societies and the published statements of eminent physicians, furnish concurrent and indisputable proof of the salutary influence of the Catholic religion in preventing, in those over whom it has influence, what physicians are constantly referring to as a cancerous moral disease, destroying the health and the vigor and the morals of the community; and that to such extent that, in New England particularly, the slow increase of population from the paucity of births in non-Catholic families, has become plainly marked.

3. We now turn to the influence of the Catholic religion as regards personal integrity. Here, too, the contrast between it and Protestantism is obvious. According to the verdict passed upon us by Europeans, official dishonesty and corruption prevail among us to a degree unknown in any of the nations of the Old World, unless perhaps Turkey and Russia. The exact correctness of this judgment we need not here examine, nor is it necessary to make any comparison between ourselves as a people, and those of other civilized countries as regards the decline amongst us of honesty and strict integrity. That there is a lamentable absence of these virtues is generally admitted.

Can the Catholic religion do anything to check and correct this? We have seen that Protestantism cannot. In proof that the Catholic religion can, and does, we direct attention to the following considerations:

1st. Dishonesty is a vice which usually develops itself by a gradual process. A man previously honest may, and sometimes does, under the influence of overpowering temptation, commit a flagrantly dishonest act; but such instances are rare and exceptional. Covetousness, inordinate love for money, or for what money will purchase, for the power, influence, and social position which it may be made the indirect means of obtaining, are prime motives, usually, to dishonest and corrupt conduct. With those who are outside of the Catholic Church, and who believe in no religion, there is nothing except the individual's own personal integrity, his sense of what is due to himself and to others, his personal pride and self-respect, to hold him back, and enable him to stand firmly on the ground of strict honesty. There is nothing, if he is a Protestant, beyond his own personal regard and reverence for the divine commandments. His religion is a thing entirely between him and his God. His inward struggles, his temptations to swerve from the straight line of rectitude, are hidden in his own heart and seen only by the eye of Him to whom all things are visible. Evil desires may take possession of him and gradually eat away all strength of purpose, so that when temptation assails him, it finds him weak, helpless, disarmed, and incapable of resistance. Or, he may but slightly deviate at first from the straight path of honesty; the act may be repeated, again and again, each repetition becoming greater and bolder, during all the while, until the dishonesty becomes so flagrant that farther concealment is impossible. He has had, meanwhile, nothing to restrain him, nothing to strengthen him when he attempted to resist, but his own personal sense of right and wrong. There was no one to whom he could lay bare the inmost secrets of his heart, no one to whom he could speak with absolute unreserve of his temptations, his struggles, his sin; and then, beyond and above all this, and what is of infinitely greater importance, there was no one who could speak *to* him with the voice of DIVINE AUTHORITY, who could warn him, check him, restrain him, at the very outset of his dishonest career, and prevent his entering upon it; who, even before the temptation assumed form and shape, could bring to light the seeds of sin lurking in his heart in the form of hidden desires of which he himself was perhaps unconscious, and which, if not plucked out, would sprout into dishonest acts.

The Catholic religion supplies all that we have seen is here wanting in Protestantism, and supplies it effectually. The individual is not left to himself to stand or fall, as the case may eventuate in

the time of trial. The whole power of the Church, speaking and acting with divine authority, comes in to sustain him. There can be no gradual, unconscious falling away in personal integrity; no unconscious cherishing of feelings and desires that sap his firmness of purpose, gradually weakening, and in the end destroying his rectitude of character, without his becoming aware of it until revealed to him by his fall. In the confessional his heart is laid bare to him who sits there as the representative and vicar of Christ, clothed with that authority with which Christ has invested him, the bearer and applier of the healing power, the efficacious medicine for all moral disease, comprehended in the pregnant declaration: "WHO HEARETH YOU, HEARETH ME;" "Whoso sins *ye* forgive they *are* forgiven." The penitent who has been assailed by conscious temptation, or in whose heart desires which, if indulged in, would grow and bring forth noxious fruit in the form of dishonest acts, goes into that confessional and lays bare his heart. His own exposure of his spiritual condition is aided, if necessary, by the questions or suggestions of the priest who sits there as a spiritual physician, and who, not simply with the aid of human study of moral disease and human experience as to its indications and symptoms, but with the keener, clearer, and far more penetrating insight specially given by divine help in the tribunal of penance, probes searchingly yet tenderly the spiritual wounds of his penitent to their inmost depth, warns him, instructs him, reproves him, encourages and consoles him.

How such an institution (humanly speaking, if we dare so speak of a divinely constituted sacrament), works to deliver from temptation those who otherwise would yield to it; how it confirms those who are already firm of purpose, and gives strength to those who are weak, persons who are outside of the communion of the Church have some faint idea of, but can never fully understand until they have bathed in the healing invigorating waters of this spiritual Bethsaida. The penitent goes into the tribunal of penance, worn, weary, defiled with the dust and sweat of his conflicts with temptation, bowed down under a consciousness of his sins; he comes forth, healed, cleansed, refreshed, invigorated, prepared to keep watch and ward with keener vigilance against the first beginning of temptation, and to strive with increased earnestness of purpose to preserve his integrity.

This is no ideal picture, no fancy sketch drawn from a mere subjective conception of the tribunal of penance, or confessional, as it is usually called. Every Catholic who regularly and faithfully attends to his religious duties will recognize its fidelity to the actual reality of his own experience. And the world, though destitute of this knowledge, yet reasoning from what it sees and learns, bears

testimony to the truth of all we have said, in the judgment it practically pronounces on those whom it knows regularly approach the tribunal of penance. Whatever feeling it may have as regards them in other respects, it knows that they have a safeguard in the habit, which gives them moral strength beyond any that attaches to them personally. We need only refer in proof of this to the fact, that many employers who have no belief in the Catholic religion as divinely revealed and divinely established, and no specially kind feelings towards it or towards Catholics, yet encourage those of their employees who are Catholics, to go regularly to confession, under the conviction that by so doing they will secure on the part of those employees greater fidelity to the interests intrusted to them and a more conscientious discharge of their duties.

2d. The public is aware, to some extent at least, of the influence of the Catholic Church in causing restitution by penitents, of moneys and property dishonestly acquired. They know that the Catholic doctrine of contrition for sin, requires more than a mere feeling of sorrow for the sin committed. *Penance* is not in the Catholic faith, as is repentance in the Protestant belief, a mere sentiment of regret; it is a real act as well as a deep feeling; it looks forward to the future in the form of sincere and firm resolve to abstain from sin; as regards the present and the past, it requires actual reparation. The public becomes aware, from time to time, of restitution made for thefts, for peculations and for other acts of dishonesty. But it becomes acquainted, probably, with not one-twentieth part of the instances in which restitution is made.

How powerfully this doctrine of the Church, a doctrine that, like all Catholic doctrine, is not a dead letter, or a mere theory, but a living operative principle, works to prevent dishonesty, and prevent Catholics yielding to temptation, in either their private relations, or their public official positions, must be apparent. Catholics know that if they commit wrong, the consequences of that wrong will follow them throughout life, requiring reparation to the full extent of ability to make it. No law of limitation, no lapse of time exonerates from the obligation. If the wrong was committed in youth or early manhood, and the ability to repair it comes only with extreme old age, the reparation must be made, or the guilt of withholding that reparation will rest upon the soul of the wrong-doer.

Catholics know this, believe this. It is surely unnecessary to point out how powerful a restraint it is upon those who are tempted to swerve from the path of rectitude.

The force of what we have said will be in no way weakened nor its point blunted by statements that, nevertheless, there are unchaste, and dishonest Catholics, persons who are known as Catho-

lics, persons who believe the Catholic religion to be true, who believe in no other religion, and who yet notoriously break the commandments forbidding adultery and theft. There are such Catholics, we freely admit. They occupy, however, a very different relation to the Church, than persons of like character occupy in Protestant religious organizations. They may rent prominent pews in Catholic churches, may make liberal donations to objects of Catholic charity, may be prominent as regards social position, wealth, influence in business and political circles, but all the prominence they acquire in the Church itself, is prominence in *not* attending faithfully and regularly to their religious duties. They are known to the priest, known to themselves, and soon become known to their fellow-Catholics, as persons who, whatever else they may be, or may not be, however high they may stand socially, however they may be personally esteemed, however wide their personal influence, yet still they are *not* PRACTICAL Catholics. They are *not* seen frequently entering the tribunal of penance, confessing and obtaining absolution for their sins; nor regularly assisting at "the tremendous Sacrifice of the Altar;" nor regularly approaching the Holy Table and receiving on bended knees, the Bread of Heaven. Their very relation to the Church, therefore, proves the power the Church exerts through her doctrines and sacraments. In the case of such Catholics they not only do not, but *cannot*, continue in the *wilful* commission of known sin, and yet approach the sacraments of the Church. However numerous such Catholics may be, they prove nothing, therefore, against what we have said; for, they are notoriously those whose faith is not accompanied with good works, and who neglect to avail themselves of the means by which the Church guides, strengthens and purifies those who wish to be guided, strengthened, and purified by her.

4. We have spoken of the inability of Protestantism to influence the poor, and bridge over the chasm, daily becoming wider and deeper, between the destitute and the well-to-do classes. The Catholic Church is emphatically the Church of the poor. No one is excluded from her sacraments because of rank or social position. The wealthy, the highborn, the noble, the king, are welcomed, but they come, if they come at all, poor in spirit, whatever they may be as regards external circumstances; and they must bow as humbly and as contritely as the meanest beggar, if they desire to receive the sacraments of the Church. But upon this point we need not dwell. The Catholic Church is the known and acknowledged "Church of the poor." It is felt and known by the poor themselves; it is felt and known by the world at large. The Catholic religion is the only religion that reaches, and that ever has effectually reached them. If then, that part of the people of

the United States, daily becoming larger, which may be classed among the poor, are to be brought and kept under the influence of Christianity, it will only be through the Catholic Church. This, and the remark holds good both as to the virtuous poor and to the vicious, is so generally admitted that we need not enlarge upon it.

As regards the antagonisms in society, daily becoming deeper and more pronounced, and felt by all who study "the signs of the times," to constitute a real peril to the peace of society and the stability of our political institutions, no other power than that of the Catholic religion can hold these antagonisms in check, can restrain the passions to which they give rise, and infuse that goodwill by which alone those, who are now regarding each other with feelings of mutual distrust, if not with fear and hate, can be prevented from coming into open collision.

These antagonisms existed in pagan Rome, deep and bitter. They almost disappeared during the Middle Ages under the influence of Catholicity. There were differences then as regards rank, wealth, social position, and social influence. Society was divided into classes; and the differences and distinctions between them were then more marked than they now are, in any country. Christianity did not originate those differences and distinctions, though she did recognize them, and did not attempt in any violent way to destroy them. But Christianity did, during the Middle Ages, not only soften down those differences, and eventually destroy some of them, but, what is still more to the point, she so authoritatively and effectively inculcated into the minds of all the law of Christian charity, that the feelings of bitterness and hatred which those distinctions would have otherwise engendered, were replaced by feelings of mutual regard and consideration. The haughtiness and contempt which, outside the Church, the powerful felt and manifested towards the weak, had to give way when noble and the king were taught that the lowest of his vassals and the meanest of his slaves were their brothers in Christ, who might, by patient endurance of the rigors of their lot, attain higher seats and more glorious crowns in the kingdom of Christ than they; and when they had practical evidence of this in the Church's frequently investing some one from the lowest ranks of society with the power of a priest or the dignity of a bishop, and requiring the noble of the earth to do him reverence.

In like manner she taught the poor slave patience and submission, under the conviction that whatever might be the toil that wore out his body, however mean his employment in the eyes of men, his thralldom and humiliation touched not his soul, and that at the Altar of His God, and in the sacraments of the Church, he was free and equal to the mightiest who wore a crown and sat upon

a throne; and that for every menial service he performed, for all the toil and humiliation he endured under earthly masters, if performed and endured for the sake of Christ who died for him, yet still lived and personally communed with him when he received Him at the Altar, he, the poor bond slave, would be recompensed a hundred fold by an inheritance of ineffable peace and never-fading glory in the kingdom of Heaven.

Thus rich and poor, mighty and weak, highborn and low, were brought together in the Church, not as enemies, but as more than friends, as brothers in Christ.

And, though in those ages of transition—wild and stormy as such ages (and with such material as the Church had to deal with) necessarily must be,—this law of Christian charity was not always observed in practice; though the wild, fierce feelings and traditions of previous barbarism occasionally broke through the restraints imposed upon them, and though the law of Christian charity was thus violated, yet the existence and the obligations of the law were acknowledged, and the violations became fewer and less flagrant as the influence of the Church increased.

Protestantism when it acquired power, checked the progress of the law of universal charity. In the peoples over whom it has obtained sway questions respecting the mutual rights and interests of rich and poor, employer and employee have been taken out of the scope of religion and given over to the human sciences, so called, of political economy and social philosophy. The countless charitable foundations through which the Church alienated suffering and supplied destitution were destroyed; the influences by which she repressed the antagonism of different classes in society were resisted and opposed; and now those antagonisms are again manifesting themselves, as they did in ancient heathen Rome, threatening to break out with like violence and with like disastrous effects; or if they are repressed, are repressed only by superior force, treading down the poor into the dust, but leaving in their hearts deep feelings of bitter hate and a fierce desire for vengeance, utterly incompatible with that peace which Christ came to give.

What the Catholic Church has done in the past, she can do in the present and future; she is doing it in the face of all the efforts to embarrass and thwart her action. Even those who hate and fear her, feel this. She is, and she is recognized as, the only power that can hold together in bonds of amity and Christian love the otherwise hostile classes of society.

5. The last point we referred to in our discussion of Protestantism was reverence for the majesty and divine authority of law. We showed that in its fundamental principle Protestantism denies his, and that the Protestant principle of private judgment when car-

ried out logically to its legitimate consequences destroys in the individual the sense of moral obligation to obey law.

To this can clearly be traced the lawlessness of our age, and this is now the special peril that hangs over society. The Catholic Church squarely meets it with uncompromising opposition. It denounces as a doctrine of the devil, the idea that law is nothing more than the expression of the arbitrary wishes and purposes of individuals. It teaches that it has its origin in the will of God, that from Him it derives its authority, its sanctions, its right to enforce its enactments. Thus it strikes at the very root of the evil which now threatens the peace of society and in fact imperils its very existence.

We cannot enlarge upon this, but the truth that this is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and that it is powerfully effective in preserving social order and peace, is acknowledged both by those who believe in and revere the teaching of the Church, and by those who disbelieve and oppose it.

In Europe the monarchs and kings who hate and fear the Church, and who would, if they could, make her their bondslave to do their behests, are well aware of the conservative influence of the Church and avail themselves of it for their protection, even whilst they are plotting and warring against her. She is the only barrier against the destructive spirit of radical revolution which aims at sweeping away not only dynasties and thrones, but every political institution which stands between civil society and the mere arbitrary will and passions of individuals; which, under the pretext of popularizing the institutions of society, would destroy them and enthrone in their place, under the name of a republic, an absolutism, of which, as to character and consequences, the "Reign of Terror" in France is a historical exemplification.

We have entirely failed in our purpose, if we have not clearly shown, imperfect as is our statement of the influence exerted by the Catholic religion as respects the five points stated, that to it the people of the United States must look for the correcting, purifying, preserving, and conservative power which alone can arrest the decadence in morals now plainly going on amongst them, and which alone can infuse and keep alive those principles of integrity, of purity, of reverence for law and authority, of Christian charity, without which no nation can become or can continue, truly great and noble. The increased influence of the Catholic religion instead of being (as some pretend) a source of apprehension, therefore, as regards our future prosperity, should be looked upon as affording strong ground for hope that we will not fail in the grand and glorious mission which, as a people, we have, at least until recently, firmly believed we were destined to fulfil.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### MISSIONARY RECTORS.

[It gives us pleasure to lay before our readers the following letter from Rev. F. Porphyrius. He need make no apology for its form. Any communication from his pen, whether in epistolary or other form, will always find a place in our pages. The translation he adopts of the "Instruction," which has caused such a stir as its transatlantic framers could never have anticipated, is timely. It is, besides, sufficiently accurate; and his comments on the same are such that no one, we apprehend, can justly find fault with them.—Eds. A. C. Q. R.]

MESSRS. EDITORS: You will forgive me, I trust, for addressing you in what is, perhaps, an unusual way. I can only plead in excuse, though you may refuse to admit the plea, that I am not very conversant with the ways of the world, knowing but little of its arbitrary laws and fashions, and not caring much how soon even that little may fade out of my memory. Not that I am an enemy of true politeness, or prefer rudeness to courtesy. On the contrary, I have the highest respect and even veneration for true politeness, which I hold to be the legitimate outcome of the spirit of Christianity, born of the Gospel, and which can have no real existence, no life, apart from Christian charity. Hence, I would not willingly offend. If, therefore, I am now violating the etiquette of journalism, for this, too, I suppose, has its laws and fashions, you may at once punish the offence by consigning my letter to the flames.

I am somewhat of a solitary, partly from choice and partly from circumstances, and live a good deal of my life in what the world loves to call a lonely cell. Never was epithet more devoid of rhyme and reason. My cell is not lonely, but haunted by a thousand pleasing memories, and blessed by the presence of many great and good men who have gone the way of all flesh, but yet live in their immortal works. In them I find the best of company, and from their conversation derive far more pleasure and profit than I could ever hope for in the idle gossip of every-day visitors. With the outside world I do not mingle much; never, indeed, unless when summoned by the voice of authority, or persuaded by the entreaties of my clerical friends to lend them what help I can in their ministerial duties.

As neither my inclination nor my many duties allow me time to read the papers, what I know of daily events in Church and State is gathered from those clerical friends who kindly invite me now and then to share their religious labors. Of late, the most exciting topic of discussion amongst them was the recently issued "Instrutio" of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, regarding Missionary Rectors and the new mode of trial which must precede their deposition, etc. I was not a little puzzled in hearing the widely varying constructions put upon

the document by different clergymen. Some—and they were very few—modestly confessed that they did not exactly understand the whole bearing and purpose of the “Instruction,” but that the course of time and the voice of authority would bring out practically its true interpretation. Others looked on it with complete indifference, content with respecting it as the mandate of ecclesiastical authority. Some were dissatisfied and disposed to quarrel with it; they saw in it little or no good, for in their opinion it left things pretty much *in statu quo*. Others, on the contrary, hailed it with wild rejoicing as the greatest boon ever conferred by the Holy See on the American Church, the Magna Charta of emancipation from clerical serfdom of a century, the long-lost but now recovered palladium of ecclesiastical liberty.

Struck with wonder at this diversity of views, I asked for a sight of the document, and my wonder increased a hundredfold when I read the Instruction, and saw how clearly and unmistakably one was its meaning, which had been subjected to so many different interpretations. I told them as much, and even made bold to add (though they took it in good part) that they reminded me *salva reverentia* of heretics who read God’s law and revelation, not to learn its true sense, but to find in it their own conceits. “In the same way,” said I, “you read the Roman rescript and discover in it, not what it contains, but what is uppermost in your heart and desires. Why do you not get a literal, accurate translation of the document? It will be a great help towards discovering its true meaning.” “Oh! we have studied it in a translation,” quoth one of the Magna Charta partisans. “And, pray, who made the translation?” I ventured to ask. “The editor of the St. Louis *Western Watchman*,” he replied with an air of triumphant defiance. I recognized at once the vulgar American prejudice, which, professing to scout all authority, human and divine, bows down blindly to the newspaper as its oracle, and was about to express myself to that effect. But luckily I held my peace; for, as I afterwards learned, there was among my hearers a gentleman of the press. And even in my uneventful life I have had occasion to find out that the wrath of newspaper-men, book-makers, *et id genus omne*, is no less implacable than that of the “godlike Achilles.” So I merely inquired for a copy of the translation, which when handed to me I read over carefully, comparing it meanwhile with the original Latin. When I had done reading, my opinion was asked. Compelled thus to speak the truth, I candidly stated that the translation did not seem to me quite accurate in some places; but (this I added to propitiate all sides) since the document had been interpreted in various ways, it was to be expected that it should be differently translated by different hands, translation being only a form of interpretation. They then asked me to translate it. To this I agreed on one condition, namely, that when I had written it out, I should send it to the editors of the REVIEW, and ask their opinion of its fidelity. To this they all assented, and, what is more, pledged themselves to abide by the editors’ decision.

Hence, you see, Messrs. Editors, that I had a good and sufficient motive for writing to you, though I may not have done it in the right way. Of this I leave you to judge.

A few days after this conversation I received a copy of the *Catholic Standard*, containing a translation of the "Instruction," which, on reading and comparing with the Latin, struck me as having been carefully made, and a faithful rendering of the original document. I therefore adopt it, instead of making a translation myself. Please republish it together with the Latin text, amending, if any amendment is necessary. With your permission I will follow it with a few remarks on its general scope, and on the intention and meaning of some of its clauses.

*Instructio S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide. De modo servando ab Episcopis Fœderatorum Septentrionalis Americæ Statuum in cognoscendis et definiendis causis criminalibus et disciplinaribus Clericorum.*

Quamvis Concilium Plenarium Baltimorensis II. ab Apostolica Sede recognitum, certam quamdam iudicii formam, iam antea a Concilio Provinciali S. Ludovici sancitam, in criminalibus clericorum causis ab ecclesiasticis curiis diœcesium Fœderatorum septentrionalis Americæ Statuum pertractandis servandam esse decreverit, experientia tamen compertum est, statutum iudicii ordinem haud undequaque parem esse ad querelas eorum præcavendas, quos pœna aliqua multari contigerit. Sæpe enim postremis hisce temporibus accidit, ut presbyteri iudiciis ea ratione initis latisque sententiis damnati, remoti præsertim ab officio rectoris missionari, huc illuc de suis Prælatiis conquesti fuerint et frequenter etiam ad Apostolicam Sedem recursus detulerint. Dolendum autem est, non raro evenire, ut in transmissis actis plura, eaque necessaria, desiderentur atque perpensis omnibus, gravia sæpe dubia oriantur circa fidem documentis hisce in causis allatis habendam vel denegandam.

Quæ omnia S. Congregatio fidei propagandæ præpositæ serio perpendens, aliquod remedium hisce incommodis parandum, ac ita iustitiæ consulendum esse censuit, ut neque insontes clerici per iniuriam pœna afficiantur, neque alicuius criminis rei ob minus rectam iudiciorum formam a promerita pœna immunes evadant. Quod quidem facili pacto obtineret, si omnes præscriptiones a sacris canonibus sapienter editas pro ecclesiasticis iudiciis, præsertim criminalibus, ineundis et absolvendis servandas omnino esse præciperet. Verum animo reputans, in prædictis Fœderatorum Ordinum regionibus id facile servari non posse, ea ratione providendum esse duxit, ut saltem illæ de admissio crimine accurate peragantur investigationes, quæ omnino necessariae existimantur, antequam ad pœnam irrogandam deveniatur.

Itaque SSmo. Domino Nostro Divina Providentia PP. Leone XIII. approbante, in generalibus comitiis habitis die 25 Iunii 1878 S. C. decrevit, ac districte mandavit, ut singuli memoratæ regionis sacrorum Antistites, in Diœcesana Synodo quamprimum convocanda quinque, aut ubi ob pecularia rerum adiuncta tot haberi nequeant, tres saltem presbyteros ex probatissimis et quantum fieri poterit in iure canonico peritis seligant, quibus consilium quoddam iudiciale, seu, ut appellant, Commissio investigationis constituatur, eidemque unum ex electis præficiant. Quod si ob aliquam gravam causam Synodus diœcesana statim haberi nequeat, quinque vel tres prouti supra per Episcopum interim ecclesiastici viri ad munus de quo agitur deputentur.

Commissionis ita constitutæ princeps erit officium criminales atque

disciplinares presbyterorum aliorumque clericorum causas, iuxta normam mox proponendam, ad examen revocare, rite cognoscere ac ita Episcopo in ipsis definiendis auxilium præbere. Satagant propterea oportet ad hoc munus electi, ut accuratæ fiant investigationes, ea proferantur testimonia atque a præsumpto reo omnia exquirantur, quæ ad veritatem eruendam necessaria censentur ac ad iustam sententiam tuto prudenterque ferendam certa vel satis firma argumenta suppeditent.

Quod si de alicuius Rectoris missionis remotione agatur, nequeat ipse a credito sibi munere deiici, nisi tribus saltem prædictæ commissionis membris per Episcopum ad causam cognoscendam adhibitis, eorumque consilio audito.

Electi Consilarii in suscepto munere permanebunt ad proximam usque Diœcesanæ Synodi celebrationem, in qua vel ipsi confirmentur in officio vel alii designentur. Quod si interim morte, aut renuntiatione vel alia causa præscriptus Consiliarium numerus minuat, Episcopus extra Synodum alios in deficientium locum, prout superius statutum est, sufficiat.

In causis cognoscendis, iis præsertim in quibus de Rectore missionario definitive a suo officio amovendo agatur, iudicæ commissio hanc sequetur agendi rationem.

1. Ad commissionem investigationis non recurratur, nisi prius clare et præcise exposita ab Episcopo causa ad deiectionem finalem movente, ipse Rector missionarius malit rem ad Consilium deferri, quam se a munere et officio sponte dimittere.

2. Re ad Consilium delata, Episcopus vicario suo generali vel alii sacerdoti ad hoc ab ipso deputato committat, ut relationem causæ in scriptis conficiat, cum expositione investigationis eo usque peractæ, et circumstantiarum, quæ causam vel eiusdem demonstrationem specialiter afficiant.

3. Locum, diem et horam opportunam ad conveniendum indicet, idque per litteras ad singulos consiliarios.

4. Per litteras etiam Rectorem missionarium, de quo agitur, ad locum et diem constitutum ad Consilium habendum advocet, exponens, nisi prudentia vetat, uti in casu criminis occulti, causam ad deiectionem moventem, per extensum, monensque ipsum Rectorem, ut responsum suis rationibus suffultum ad ea præparet in scriptis, quæ in causæ expositione vel iam antea oretenus, vel tunc in scriptis relata fuerint.

5. Convenientibus consiliariis tempore et loco præfinitis, præcipiat Episcopus silentium servandum de iis, quæ in Consilio audiantur; moneat investigationem non esse processum iudicæ, sed eo fine habitam, et eo modo faciendam, ut ad cognitionem veritatis diligentiori qua poterit ratione perveniatur, adeo ut unusquisque consiliarius, perpensis omnibus, opinionem de veritate factorum, quibus causa innitur, efformare quam accurate possit. Moneat etiam ne quid in investigatione fiat, quod aut ipsos, aut alios periculo damni vel gravaminis exponat, præsertim ne locus detur actioni libelli famosi, vel alii cuicumque processui coram tribunali civili.

6. Relatio causæ legatur coram Consilio ab Episcopi officiali, qui etiam ad interpellationes respondebit a præside vel ab aliis consiliariis per præsidem faciendas ad uberiorem rei notitiam assequendam.

7. Deinde in Consilium introducatur Rector missionarius, qui responsum a se confectum leget, et ad interpellationes similiter respondebit, facta ipsi plena facultate ea omnia in medium afferendi, intra tempus tamen a Consilio determinandum, quæ ad propriam defensionem conferre possunt.

8. Si contingat, Rectorem missionarium, de cuius causa agitur, nolle

ad Consilium accedere, iterum datis literis vocetur, eique congruum temporis spatium ad comparandum præfiniatur, et si ad constitutum diem non comparuerit, dummodo legitime præpeditus non fuerit, uti contumax habeatur.

9. Quibus omnibus rite expletis, Consiliarii simul consilia conferant, et si maior pars consiliariorum satis constare de factis arbitretur, sententiam suam unusquisque consiliarius in scriptis exponat rationibus quibus nititur expressis; conferantur sententiæ; acta in Consilio ab episcopi officiali redigantur; a præside nomine consilii subscribantur, et simul cum sententiis singulorum in extenso ad Episcopum deferantur.

10. Quod si ulterior investigatio necessaria vel congrua videatur, eo ipso die, vel alio ad conveniendum a Consilio constituto, testes vocentur, quos opportunos Consilium iudicaverit, audito etiam Rectore missionario de iis quos ipse advocandos usse voluerit.

11. Singuli testes *pro causa* seorsim et accurate examinentur a præside et ab aliis per præsidem, absente primum Rectore missionario. Non requiratur iuramentum, sed si testes ipsi non renuant, et se paratos esse declarent ad ea quæ detulerint iuramento, data occasione, confirmanda, fiat adnotatio huiusmodi dispositionis seu declarationis in actis.

12. Consentientibus testibus, et dirigente prudentia Consilii, repetatur testimonium coram Rectore missionario qui et ipse testes si voluerit interroget per præsidem.

13. Eadem ratione qua testes *pro causa*, examinentur testes *contra causam*.

14. Collatis tunc consiliis fiat ut supra n. 9.

15. Quod si testes nolint aut nequeant Consilio assistere, vel eorum testimonium non dum satis luculentum negotium reddat, duo saltem ex Consilio deputentur, qui testes adeuntes, loca invisentes, vel alio quocumque modo poterunt, lumen ad dubia solvenda requirentes, relationem suæ investigationis ad Consilium deferant, ut ita nulla via intentata relinquatur ad verum moraliter certo cognoscendum antequam ad sententiæ prolationem deveniatur.

16. Omnia acta occasione iudici in medium allata accurate in Curia Episcopali custodiantur, ut in casu appellationis commode exhiberi valeant.

17. Si vero contingat, ut a sententia in Curia Episcopali prolata ad Archiepiscopalem provocetur, Metropolitanus eadem methodo in causæ cognitione et decisione procedat.

Datum Romæ ex ædibus præfatæ S. Congregationis die 20 Iulii anni 1878.

† IOANNES CARD. SIMEONI,  
Præfectus.

† IOANNES BAPTISTA AGNOZZI,  
Secretarius.

[TRANSLATION.]

*Instruction of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, on the Mode of Procedure to be Observed by the Bishops of the United States of North America, in Examining and Deciding Clerical Cases, whether of Crime or of Discipline.*

Although the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, approved by the Holy See, enacted that a certain kind of judicial form, already sanctioned by the Provincial Council of St. Louis, should be observed by

the ecclesiastical courts of the dioceses of the United States of North America, in criminal cases of the clergy, nevertheless experience has shown that the prescribed form of trial is not quite sufficient to prevent complaints on the part of those who happen to be visited with punishment. For, of late, it has often happened that priests condemned by judicial trial and sentence of this kind, especially when removed from the office of Missionary Rector, have complained in various quarters of their Prelates, and have had recourse, likewise, not unfrequently, to the Apostolic See. It is to be regretted, moreover, that not seldom it happens that in the official papers transmitted to us, many and, it must be added, necessary documents are wanting, so that upon examination of the whole, serious doubts frequently arise as to the credit to be accorded or refused to the documents brought forward in the cases alleged.

All which things having been seriously weighed, the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide has concluded that some remedy must be provided for these troubles, and the ends of justice attained, so that innocent clergymen may not be punished nor the guilty escape with impunity by any improper form of trial. All which could be easily effected if the Sacred Congregation were to command that the wise provisions of the Sacred Canons for conducting ecclesiastical trials from beginning to end, especially in criminal cases, should be unfailingly observed. But the Sacred Congregation, taking into consideration that in the aforesaid country this cannot be carried out without difficulty, has determined to make provision that there shall be, at least, such careful inquiry into the party's guilt as is absolutely necessary, before sentence is pronounced.

Wherefore, with the approval of our Most Holy Father, Leo, by Divine Providence thirteenth Pope of the name, in general assembly held, on the fifth day of June, 1878, the Sacred Congregation has decreed and strictly commanded, that each bishop of the country above-mentioned, in a Diocesan Synod, to be convoked as soon as possible, shall select five, or, where the peculiar circumstances of the place do not admit of such number, at least three priests, of the most worthy, and, as far as possible, skilled in canon law, who shall form, as it were, a kind of judicial council, or, as it is called, a Commission of Investigation, over which he shall appoint one of their number to preside. But if, for weighty reasons, the Diocesan Synod cannot be held immediately, let the Bishop, meanwhile, depute five or three ecclesiastics, qualified as above, for the purpose.

Of the commission, so constituted, the principal duty shall be to inquire into, and take due cognizance of, cases, whether criminal or disciplinary, of priests, and other clergymen, according to the rule which immediately follows, and thus assist the Bishop in deciding the same. Hence, those chosen must take good care to make diligent inquiry, to bring out the testimony, to interrogate the defendant on all points that may be deemed necessary to elicit the truth, so as to furnish certain, or, at least, sufficient grounds for a safe, prudent, and just decision.

And should there be question of removing a Missionary Rector, it shall not be lawful to depose him from office, unless the Bishop shall have previously engaged three at least of the aforesaid councillors to examine the case, and shall have listened to their advice.

The councillors chosen shall remain in office until the meeting of the next Diocesan Synod, wherein they shall be confirmed in their office, or new ones appointed. But if, in the meanwhile, the number of councillors be lessened by death, voluntary withdrawal, or other cause, let

the Bishop, *extra synodum*, substitute others, as above provided, in their vacant places.

In dealing with cases, those especially where it is question of definitive removal of a Missionary Rector from his office, the judicial commission shall act as follows :

I. There shall be no recourse to the Commission of Investigation, unless after a clear and precise statement by the Bishop of the cause that calls for removal, the Missionary Rector should decline to resign of his own free will, and should prefer to have his case referred to the Council.

II. The matter having been laid before the Council, the Bishop shall charge his Vicar-General, or other priest deputed to this end by himself, to draw up in writing a statement of the case, with an account of the investigation as far as it has gone, and of the circumstances that may have a special bearing on the case or the evidence.

III. He shall appoint a suitable place, day, and hour, for the meeting and notify the same by letter to each councillor.

IV. He shall also, by letter, summon the Missionary Rector in question to appear at the place and time appointed for holding the meeting, stating in detail (unless prudence will have it otherwise, as in the case of occult crime) the cause that calls for his removal, and warning him further to prepare an answer, supported by proofs, to the charges and evidence so far given, whether by word of mouth or in writing.

V. When the councillors assemble at the time and place appointed beforehand, let the Bishop enjoin secrecy as to all things that may be uttered in Council ; let him further warn them that the investigation is not a judicial process, but undertaken with the end, and to be so conducted, as in all diligence to ascertain the truth ; so that each councillor, having duly weighed all things, may be able to form an accurate opinion of the facts on which the case is based. Let him also warn them against anything during the investigation which might expose themselves, or others, to injury ; above all, that no occasion be given for libel suit or other action before a civil tribunal,

VI. A written report of the case shall be read by the official of the Bishop, who shall likewise answer all questions put by the chairman, or by the other councillors through the chairman, in order to get at the full truth of the matter.

VII. The Missionary Rector shall then be brought before the Council to read the answer he has prepared, and to answer all questions as above. He shall, further, have full liberty to produce, yet within a period of time to be determined by the Council, whatever else may help his defence.

VIII. Should it happen that the Missionary Rector, who is on trial, refuse to appear before the Council, let him be summoned once more by letter, and a suitable space of time fixed for his appearance. Should he fail to appear on the day appointed, unless he can plead legitimate excuse, let him be accounted contumacious.

IX. When all this has been duly done, let the members take counsel together, and if the greater number think the facts sufficiently proven, let each councillor state in writing his opinion with the reasons on which it is grounded, and let these opinions be collected.<sup>1</sup> An account of the

<sup>1</sup> "Gathered or brought together." The original (*Sententie conferantur*) will bear this meaning. If "*conferantur*" is used in the sense of "compare," it can only mean to compare the written vote with that given *viva voce*. But is this likely ? Any other comparing of opinions was already done during deliberation.

proceedings shall be drawn up by the Bishop's official, and signed by the chairman on behalf of the Council, which, together with the opinions of each, in full, shall be laid before the Bishop.

X. Should further investigation be deemed becoming or necessary, on the same day, or another day of meeting to be appointed by the Council, let such witnesses as the Council think fit, be called, the Missionary Rector having been allowed a hearing as to the witnesses he may wish to have summoned.

XI. Each witness for the prosecution shall be carefully examined, apart from the rest, by the chairman, and by the other councillors through the chairman, in the absence of the Missionary Rector. No oath shall be required, but if the witnesses do not refuse it, and declare themselves ready, if need be, to confirm by oath their testimony, let a note of such disposition or declaration be made in the report.

XII. Should there be no discrepancy in the testimony, and the Council in its prudence think fit, the testimony shall be repeated in presence of the Missionary Rector, who shall have the right of questioning, if he choose, the witnesses through the chairman.

XIII. Witnesses for the defence shall be questioned in the same way as witnesses for the prosecution.

XIV. After mutual deliberation, they shall proceed as above (No. IX).

XV. Should the witnesses be unwilling or unable to appear before the Council, or their testimony not be sufficient to throw light on the case, let two councillors, at least, be deputed, who, by conversing with the witnesses, visiting the localities, or endeavoring in any other way to enlighten their doubts, shall hand in to the Council a report of their investigation, so that nothing be left untried to discover with moral certainty the truth before a decision shall be given.

XVI. A record of all that has been said and done during the trial shall be carefully kept in the (archives of the) Episcopal Court, so that it may be produced without difficulty in case of appeal.

XVII. Should it happen that an appeal be taken from the judgment pronounced in the Episcopal Court to that of the Archbishop, the Metropolitan shall proceed in the same way in the trial and decision of the case.

Given at Rome, from the House of the aforesaid Sacred Congregation, the twentieth day of July, in the year 1878.

JOHN CARD. SIMEONI,  
Prefect.

JOHN BAPTIST AGNOZZI,  
Secretary.

The *Instructio* is not altogether new, for substantially it is the same that was sent to the bishops of England in the autumn of 1853. It may be found in the Appendix to the Council of Westminster.<sup>1</sup> The only point of difference worthy of notice is in No. IX. In the English document the concurrence of two-thirds (*duabus saltem ex tribus partibus*) of the councillors is required, while in our Instruction a bare majority (*major pars*) will suffice. In England two out of three, or, in the case of five councillors, four must agree.

<sup>1</sup> *Acta et Decreta I. Concilii Prov. Westmonasteriensis habiti Mense Julio, MDCCCLII. Parisiis (Migne) 1853. Appendix of Documents, p. 157.*



What is a missionary rector? As regards England, the answer is very plain. The decree of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda, instituting missionary rectors for the English Church, was issued on the 21st of April, 1852. The object of this new institution, as set forth in the preamble of the decree, was to combine and harmonize, to some extent, the creation of the hierarchy with the missionary *status* of the country, "*ut status missionis aliqua ex parte cum institutione diœcesium sit componendus.*" It then continues: "In each diocese, by authority of the bishop, but with the advice of the chapter, let some churches be chosen which appear most suitable to be considered as quasi-parishes (*ad instar parœciarum*). For these there shall be appointed a missionary rector, who shall have charge of the church and of souls, *like all the rest* (*quemadmodum cœteri*), who are appointed to churches in that country. Nevertheless, he shall be considered as permanently appointed."<sup>1</sup> The missionary rector in England, therefore, differs from the other clergy and resembles the ordinary *Parochus* solely because of his irremovability; while he differs from a parish priest and is like the other clergy in this, that he has not the care of souls *nomine proprio* or *jure proprio* (in his own name and right), but by appointment of the bishop.

But what is a missionary rector in the United States? It is very certain that we either had them already, as far as the reality goes, minus the name, or that we have them now, and are to have them henceforth, *et re et titulo*, both in name and in reality. This clearly appears from the first paragraph of the Instruction, where mention is made of "missionary rectors" in the United States who have been deprived of their office by bishops, and who have carried their complaints *huc illuc*, and even sought redress at the hands of the Holy See. Every one conversant with the history of the appeals made to Rome of late years, since the last Plenary Council of Baltimore, in 1866, must know that the appellants in all cases, perhaps without exception, were so-called "pastors" of churches, not assistants or other clergy. It is clear, therefore, that Rome already considers, and intends to consider, all duly appointed "pastors" hereafter as "missionary rectors." It makes no difference that we have received no decree, instituting the office by this special title. And much less is it necessary, or becoming, to suppose an oversight on the part of the Sacred Congregation in legislating for a class that does not exist. Missionary rectors may be legislated into existence indirectly as well as by direct enactment, where the authority that does it is supreme. Rome has signified plainly enough her good will and pleasure that our "pastors" shall henceforth be regarded as "missionary rectors." And the will of authority, however expressed, is binding. *Quod principi placuit, legis habet vigorem.* This seems to be the state of the case at present. If there is to be any limitation, it will be made known in due time.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 155.

The right to a trial before deposition is guaranteed by the Instruction to all missionary rectors; for, in their case, it is expressly stated that they cannot be deposed unless after judicial process. But this privilege is not so exclusively theirs (and this seems to have been generally overlooked), that no others can be admitted to a share of its benefits. The fourth paragraph of the Instruction distinctly states that the chief duty of the Commission of Investigation shall consist in examining the cases of priests and other clergymen (*presbyterorum et aliorum clericorum*), and thus helping the bishop to arrive at a just decision. It is not stated, indeed, that they may lay claim to having their case so investigated. But the clause reads very much like an intimation of Rome's desire, that, where possible, every sentence of condemnation should be preceded by such show of legal forms as will divest it of any shadow of arbitrary exercise of power, and leave, as far as possible, no just ground for complaint or subsequent recourse to higher authority.

This proposal, for so it may be called, by Rome of the extension of judicial forms to clerical cases generally, seems to be peculiar to this country. In the decree for England there is no mention of trial for others than missionary rectors. And though it has been stated that even the other clergy there are likewise entitled to it, the writer of these lines has looked in vain through the First, Second, and Third Provincial Councils of Westminster for anything that warrants the assertion. It may have been so provided by subsequent legislation.

The councillors who are to constitute the Council or Commission of Investigation are to be chosen in the synod but not by the synod, nor do they need its approbation. Still, as a rule, when officials are appointed in a synod, it is only right and proper to seek the advice of the synod, and such no doubt was the intention of the Council of Trent in legislating about officials to be chosen in a synod. Benedict XIV. also supposes this when he says, in an analogous case, that a bishop satisfies his obligation "*si synodi consilium exposcat, etsi ex causis sibi notis illud amplecti postea noluerit*;" that is, "provided he ask the advice of synod, even though for reasons best known to himself he decline to follow it" (*De Synodo Dioecesana*, Romæ, 1806, tom. ii. p. 92). Fagnanus, in his Commentary on the Fifth Book of the Decretals, at the chapter *Cum olim*, lays down the same doctrine (*Comment. in Decret. Venetiis*, 1697, tom. v. p. 251). And the general principle is clearly expressed by the Fifth Council of Milan, under St. Charles Borromeo, in these words:

"Quibus in actionibus aut deliberationibus ab Œcumenica Synodo Tridentina aut Provincialibus Conciliis constitutum est de Capituli Clerive consilio aliquid agendum esse; non propterea tamen illud sequendi necessitatem sibi impositam esse Episcopus existimet, nisi in iis tantum de quibus id speciatim nominatimque cautum est."—(*Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanen*, part i. p. 282.)

"In all cases and deliberations where it is enacted by the General

Council of Trent, or by Provincial Councils, that something has to be done by advice of the chapter or the clergy, let not the bishop suppose that there is laid on him thereby the necessity of following such advice, unless in those cases only where special provision to this effect by name has been made."

One of these exceptional cases is that of the *Examinatores Synodales*, who must not only be proposed in synod by the bishop, but must be agreeable to the synod and approved by the same. "*Qui Synodo satisfaciunt et ab ea probentur*," says the Council of Trent (Sess. xxiv. De Reform, cap. xviii). They are to be voted on, but whether by secret or open suffrage is a matter of no importance, as the Sacred Congregation of the Council has more than once declared.

The case of which Benedict XIV. speaks above is that of the *Judices Synodales*, whose mode of appointment, viz., in synod but not by synod, resembles exactly that of the new councillors. The end for which both are appointed and their chief functions are the same, though the former were the recipients or capable of receiving, *occasione data*, a jurisdiction, to which the latter can never lay claim. They were both intended to be means in Rome's hand for arriving at the truth, securing the ends of justice, and preventing unnecessary appeals to Rome by having all cases or most of them judged on the spot by competent judges. And had bishops throughout the world carried out the wise provisions of the Council of Trent, there would have been fewer appeals to Rome and no need of councillors. These synodal judges were clergymen of position or dignity, chosen or reappointed in each synod, and whose names were to be transmitted to the Apostolic See, in order that when necessity arose, she might delegate to them the hearing of local cases. Their station, their being on the spot, and the solemn form of their appointment, would naturally concur to impress all with the persuasion that they would prove competent judges. Yet this wise regulation so conducive to a proper administration of justice has failed, by negligence of the bishops to forward to Rome the list of synodal judges after their appointment. In the archives of the Congregation of the Council, says Benedict XIV., not one list can be found of judges, whose names were sent to Rome by any bishop. And he adds that there is but one example of it on record, and that mentioned by Card. Bellarmine. As the Holy See was never furnished with these names, she provided her own judges, and when complaints were afterward made of the incompetency of these in some cases, she quietly reminded the bishops who clamored for the employment of their own *Judices Synodales* that they themselves were to blame in not observing the plain injunction of the Council of Trent. How was she to know, much less choose out of, names that lay buried in diocesan archives? And thus "*incuria Episcoporum*," as Benedict XIV. complains, it has come to pass that the Holy See judges as she thinks fit, without the least reference to Synodal Judges. One reason that readily explains the growing uselessness of

synodal judges, was the gradual disuse of the synods in which they were appointed, though Rome provided amply even for this contingency.

What are the powers of the councillors, properly speaking? Are they judges, or fellow-judges with the bishop? Certainly not; nor is there any word in the instruction that would imply it. When they meet, they are to be expressly *warned* (Rome's own word) by the bishop that their investigation is no judicial procedure, but to be conducted solely with a view of ascertaining the truth, and of reaching a definite opinion on the truth of the facts involved in the case. When they have carefully investigated, formed a conscientious opinion, and committed it to writing, all their duties, rights, and powers have reached their limit. But may they not be said to *try* the case? They may, in a loose sense; but not according to the strict judicial meaning of the term. They only investigate; the bishop alone is the judge, and he alone decides. Yet their investigation, by law, makes part of the judicial form that must be observed before the bishop proceed to final sentence.

But, at least, the bishop will have to decide according to the votes of the majority. Not at all. The meaning of the word *vote* must first be distinctly understood, for it has two senses in ecclesiastical usage. In the first place it means suffrage exercised by right, and having power, when it obtains a majority, to control or check legislative or judicial action. Thus in a diocesan synod, when it is a question of Synodal Examiners, a majority of votes can throw out the bishop's appointees. But "vote" in ecclesiastical parlance signifies also, and perhaps much more frequently, something else. A written (or printed) opinion, containing the reasons on which it is grounded, and intended to be submitted to any ecclesiastical tribunal, theological, canonical, or otherwise, is called a *Votum*, and he who offers it is called a Councillor. If they are printed, and this is generally the case at Rome, it is invariably headed "*Votum Rdi. Consultoris N. N.*" In this sense, the opinion, reasoned out in writing, of each of the bishop's councillors, is a vote, but in no other. The bishop consults him, so to speak, and he hands in his opinion in writing. The bishop is bound to read and duly weigh it. He is not bound to follow it. But in the Roman Instruction the word *votum*, though it might have perhaps been used, is not used at all, and perhaps designedly. The words used are "*audito eorum consilio*," "after hearing their advice." This the bishop *must* do. But to listen to their advice and weigh it, is one thing; to contract thereby a legal obligation to follow it, is quite another. The general principle governing this matter was laid down in the words I have quoted above from St. Charles's Fifth Council of Milan. "Where it is enjoined, that something must be done by advice of chapter or clergy, let not the bishop suppose that this imposes on him the *necessity* of following such advice." Their advice is no legal check to his decision. It is intended as a moral check to summary, unconsidered sentence, or rather a moral help

to just and equitable decision. And there will be no danger, ordinarily speaking, of its being disregarded.

If there be nothing more in the Instruction, some one may ask, what is the use of it? Has the American Church gained any substantial good by the change? Had I to answer in the affirmative, I might fail to convince some of those who gratuitously thrust themselves forward as first and sole interpreters of the document. For, very likely, they are now groaning under their disappointment. They have found out, it is to be feared, that in their case the wish was father to the thought; and that in those wild outbursts of rapture with which they saluted the Instruction, they were only blindly worshipping the figments of their own disordered imagination. Nor let my clerical friends blame me if, addressing a wider circle, I repeat in stronger terms what I more than once said to them in conversation. Those who prefer cool reflection to hasty argument, the more calmly they study out the true meaning of the document, the more readily will they be convinced of its obvious sense. I wish to assert nothing special of my own faculty of interpretation, much less to boast that I have succeeded in disengaging the true sense from all clouds of doubt. But I have endeavored to do so, and am willing to be further taught and enlightened by those who are wiser than myself.

But to return to the question: Will this change be productive of good? Any one who has due reverence for Rome can scarcely bring himself calmly to debate the question whether a canonical regulation for the better government of the American Church, long and patiently discussed and weighed at Rome, and at last deliberately adopted by one of her highest tribunals, is or is not likely to benefit our Church. There can be no doubt that it must and will do good. It is not class legislation, as some unthinkingly imagine and say, meant to exalt one order of the clergy at the expense of the other. It is intended for the common good, both of bishops and of priests.

It does not deprive the bishop of any of his faculties, or strip him of the least portion of his governing and judicial power. It only adds to his episcopal administration of justice the perpetual prestige of an ecclesiastical court, of which he is central point and sole judge, and of which the new judicial forms will only serve to invest his decisions with additional weight and dignity. As to the second order of the clergy, it protects them from the effects and evil consequences, as it protects their superiors from the responsibility, of arbitrary use of power. For even legitimate power may be arbitrarily used. It makes it nearly impossible for an innocent man to be involved in unjust condemnation; it cuts off all or almost all hope from the guilty of escaping just punishment.

It will also be an advantage to Rome. Appeals will no longer be the miserable, loose, slipshod things they were, a mere waste of time and money, ending in uncertainty or in utter hopelessness of ever coming to a decision. Besides, the cases of recourse to the Holy See

will be, necessarily, much fewer. And when it does take place, as the whole *procès verbal* must be forwarded to Rome, one hour's examination of it will be sufficient to bring to light the merits or the worthlessness of the appeal.

The new legislation introduced by the Instruction will do good everywhere, and therefore should everywhere find a welcome. It has also in it germs of further development for good, of which we may learn hereafter. It should neither be hailed with intemperate exultation, nor frowned upon in a skeptical, captious, fault-finding spirit; but like every other boon that comes to us from our mother, Rome, it should be received with devotion, reverence, and thankfulness.

Wishing to yourselves, Messrs. Editors, and to your journal, a prosperous New Year, I remain,

Your humble servant in Dno,

F. PORPHYRIUS.

## BOOK NOTICES.

ELEMENTS OF INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY. By *Rev. F. De Concilio*.

This is the first instalment of a work intended by the author to cover the whole range of philosophy. It is meant to be a textbook for those especially who are unable to read any of the ordinary handbooks of philosophy written in Latin. We cannot but be thankful to those whose labors help to render this study less severe, and to bring it within the reach of larger numbers of our youth. There can be no question that for Catholics the study of philosophy is a necessity. In the intellectual, as in the religious world around them, the utmost anarchy prevails. The revolt against the Church was followed by an effort to discard the scholastic system of philosophy, which the most distinguished men in the Church had used and consecrated to her service. But the attempt has ended in disaster. The history of modern philosophy reveals a succession of systems, one more erroneous and pernicious than another; idealism, sensism, skepticism, pantheism, materialism, nihilism; of which the outcome is chaos.

The literature of the day, with which young Catholics must become more or less familiar, reflects this confusion and contradiction. The books of science, the reviews, and magazines, which they can scarcely be expected not to read, abound in reckless assertions, false assumptions, or illogical conclusions, which it is essential that they should be able to detect and expose. They must know how, at a glance, to distinguish a fallacy from an argument, and recognize sophistry from sound reasoning. More than this, to sustain their part as educated Catholics, they must be ready not only to refute, but also to convince; not only to defend the truth, but also to attack error and rout its forces; to uphold the truths of reason as well as to guard those of revelation. Hence the need, greater now than ever before, of studying the science of philosophy, and especially of a careful training in logic.

For this reason, on its first appearance, we welcomed Fr. De Concilio's book as an encouraging sign that there was a greater demand

among Catholics for works on philosophy, and that competent men were devoting themselves to the task of preparing such works for the public. On its merits as a textbook we were not yet ready to speak. We waited till we could examine it more at leisure, and hear from teachers whose experience would give weight to their judgment. Now that we have read it, we must say that we are somewhat disappointed in it. Whilst it cannot be denied considerable merit, it has also serious defects. Nor can it serve as a safe and useful textbook without much correction and many changes.

The reverend author frankly invites criticism from "the learned professors of this study scattered throughout the land, from whom we (the author) shall thankfully receive any suggestions or corrections which they shall see fit to make." Emboldened by this invitation, we venture to make some observations. And first, as to the form. To many the catechetical form of question and answer appears to be too puerile for a textbook on philosophy. A professor who cannot formulate questions for his pupils as well as any author can do it, is not fit for his office. But if this form *is* used, as it is in some compendiums of theology, at least let the questions be real questions; let them be to the point, and lead easily to the answer. In these respects the book before us is very defective, as may be seen at a glance almost anywhere throughout the volume.

The subjects treated in the "Elements" are generally well divided and distinctly stated. We cannot admit, however, that the author's opinions are always sound or his explanations as clear as they should be. Even a hasty examination will disclose several instances of confused or incorrect statements, and so large a number of verbal inaccuracies and grammatical mistakes that we are at a loss to account for them except on the score of extreme haste. We will point out some examples.

In the introduction, Art. II., in answer to the question, "How is philosophy divided?" the author first divides *being* into rational, real, and moral. After defining each of these parts or divisions of being, using the definite article, however, incorrectly, he goes on as follows: "The rational (being) is called logic, etc. The moral (being) is the science of ethics, etc. The real (being) is called metaphysics, and is subdivided into *three* parts, because, as St. Thomas observes, real being may be classified under *four* heads." Of course, *three* is a printer's mistake. But the reverend author must pardon us for saying that these sentences denote unmistakable confusion of ideas. Logic is not rational being, but, from treating of rational being, is called rational science, etc. On page 12, we read: "The natural philosopher studies the body." Not at all. It is the physician that studies the body; the natural philosopher studies bodies. This is one of the many instances where a wrong use is made of the definite article. Another may be found on the same page. But in truth, they are "too numerous to mention."

On page 32 we find this curious specimen of scholarship: "The word *universal* is derived from the Latin words *unum versus alia*, and signifies a thing which refers to many." This has, at least, the merit of novelty. To say that the Latin word *universalis* is derived from *unum versus alia* is just as correct as to say that *universaliter* is derived from *unum versus alia ter*. It is well known to every one who has studied Latin etymology, that there is a large class of adjectives in *alis* derived from substantive nouns or adjectives, and that *universalis* is one of these, derived from *universus*, which is formed of *uni* and *versus*, meaning *turned* or *gathered into one, entire, whole*.

On page 21 we read this definition of logic: "Logic may be generally understood as meaning the right use of those faculties which

are destined to acquire knowledge." That is, logic is the right use of the reasoning faculties. We had an idea that logic *teaches* the right use of those faculties. Compare this sentence with the one quoted above: "The rational (*being*) is called logic," and it will be hard to say which is the graver mistake. If clearness of ideas and precision of language are needed at all times in a treatise on philosophy, they are especially necessary in definitions. We think the author singularly unhappy in this Introduction to Logic. We can admit neither his division of logic nor the explanation he gives of it. And it is on his own principles that we feel compelled to reject both.

And first, the division is faulty. Logic is *not* divided into natural and scientific. It is divided into natural and artificial or acquired. Either kind may also be scientific. One who has by nature strong powers of reasoning and a correct judgment is said to possess *natural* logic. If he knows by the force of native genius or, better still, by education, the leading principles on which sound reasoning depends, his logic, on the author's own showing, is *scientific*. If, besides, he is trained in the application of those principles and knows how to use the *rules* of logic, he is said to be versed in *artificial* logic. The argument to prove that logic is not an *art* does not convince. It proves too much. Indeed, it would follow that music, painting, any of the fine arts, or any of the industrial arts, would cease to be an art, if the artist should know the principles of the science on which his art depends. There is no need to enlarge on this point. We hold with the best authors, that logic may be considered both as an art and a science. And in this connection we may be allowed to observe, that there appears in this volume a striking disregard of the views and merits of other authors distinguished in this branch of study. A reasonable respect for the opinions of others, at least some indication that there *are* other opinions entitled to consideration, will do more to gain the favor of the judicious than the most positive tone of assurance. We think an impartial examination of this book will discover no grounds for overconfident satisfaction on the part of the author. We will go on with our list of errors.

In treating of certainty our author is obscure, from failing to distinguish between subjective and objective certainty, or rather between certitude and certainty.

For certitude, according to Dr. Newman, is a state of the mind ; certainty, a quality of propositions.

Thus on page 83, certainty is defined to be: "That state of the mind by which it firmly adheres to a known truth without fear of the opposite." This is evidently subjective certainty or certitude, though it is very awkward to speak of a *state of the mind by which it* (the mind) *adheres*, etc. Then follows this sentence: "It (that is, that state of the mind called certainty) may be *metaphysical*, *physical*, and *moral*." We think this division is applicable only to objective certainty or the certainty of propositions.

Among the incorrect expressions and inaccurate statements which are plentifully sprinkled throughout the book, we may notice the following: On page 105 the fallacy which our author calls *ignorantia elenchi* is, we presume, our old acquaintance *ignoratio elenchi*. The former is generally regarded as a species of the latter. There is a wide difference between "ignorance of the point at issue" and "ignoring or evading the point at issue." Besides the incorrect use of the definite article, to which we referred above, we noticed several instances of the wrong tense used. For an example, see page 148, the first sentence in the Introduction to Ontology. The explanation of *universals* is not satisfac-



tory. They are not well defined, and no distinction is made between *direct* and *reflex* universals. The chapter on Being contains several errors. *Equivocal* seems to be taken for *analogical*, and *univocal* for *identical*. How can being be "predicated of itself *univocally*," when univocal means a term (p. 56) "that is applied to *several* objects under the same signification?" And what is meant by this sentence in Article 3? "We have said that being is predicated univocally only of itself, therefore it is attributed analogically to all other subjects." What subjects are these which are not being? The last paragraph in the third chapter on the distinction between Essence and Existence is simply unintelligible.

On page 181, in the article on the Beautiful, besides the expression "the beautiful natural," already noticed in the *Catholic World*, we must object to the following sentence: "Man is composed of body and soul; the body consists of motive, vegetative, sensitive faculties; the soul of intellectual and volitive faculties." Can a substance which is endowed with faculties be said to *consist* of those faculties?

On page 190 there are two mistakes. It is not grammatical to speak, as this article does repeatedly, of "introducing form *in* matter." An arrow does *not* reach the mark because it is *thrown* by the archer. Arrows are supposed to be *shot* with a bow.

On page 195 "particular goods" should be "a particular good." Goods (the plural noun) means wares or property.

On page 196 we are told that, "a man digging the foundation of a house finds a treasure. The actual effect of the man's action is digging, but accidentally the other effect is connected with it." Not so. Though the finding of a treasure may be accidental, it is also actual, unless it should take place in a dream. Actual is not opposed to accidental, but to potential or virtual.

On page 174, in the article on "The Goodness of Being," we must take exception to the definition of goodness, as too restricted. It applies only to that which is *formally* good, whereas it ought to include also that which is *fundamentally* good, or which contains the reason and foundation of goodness. Not only is that good which *is* sought after, but also that which *may be* sought after, which contains in itself a reason why it may be an object of appetite. If the definition does not include this, it cannot be applied to the three kinds into which the author divides "goodness." But why omit the very important division of which the old authors make so much, the "*bonum honestum, delectabile utile*?"

On page 215 the author explains the nature of accident. "It is intrinsically necessary for the nature of (the) accident to be supported; but it is quite indifferent to the same nature *what* it is supported by—by its own substance, or any other force sufficient to uphold it." Here there is some confusion of ideas, arising, we think, from the use of the word *indifferent*. If this were true, as it reads, it would follow that there is no extraordinary exercise of divine power in the Holy Eucharist. If it be "indifferent to the very nature of accident *what* it is supported by," then in every case it would require the action of some extrinsic cause to determine it to "its own substance or to some other force sufficient to uphold it." In other words, if this be true, accident does not inhere in substance by the force of its nature, but remains in suspense, *indifferent* till its mode of existence or its inherence is determined by Omnipotence. This we cannot admit. It is not indifferent to the nature of accident *what* it is supported by. It belongs to its nature to inhere in a subject. Inherence in substance is necessary to the very notion or definition of accident. Not, indeed, that it must *actually* in-

here in a subject ; but it has that aptitude and tendency by the exigence of its nature. Hence it can never be *indifferent* as to what it is supported by. It has by nature a fixed tendency to inhere in a substance. What God does in the Eucharist is not to change the nature of accident, but to supply, by his power, that which before was done for the accidents, by the substance ; that is, to uphold them in existence supernaturally.

On page 230 the author undertakes to show how grammar is founded on ontology. His theory is partly false and partly fanciful. Grammar, as an art, is concerned with the rules for speaking and writing a language correctly. As a science it deals with the principles common to all languages. In so far as it treats of the connection between ideas and words it is a rational science, and belongs to logic rather than to ontology. It is not true that "our speech is real and objective, because the verb *to be* necessarily implies real existence." This is a fanciful theory of ontologists. The verb *to be* can be employed to express abstract concepts, universal ideas, and possible things. Our speech is real and objective when our ideas represent real and objective things. No doubt every language and all speech must express *being*, with its properties and categories, causes, relations, etc., since these include all that can be talked or written about. But the art of grammar is no more dependent on ontology than the art of logic. Let the author select an example more to the point.

Thus far we have dealt principally with the defects of Fr. De Concilio's Elements. It is evident that some of the faults we have pointed out, are of a more serious character than others. Some are merely grammatical errors or verbal inaccuracies, which, though very unsightly in a textbook, do not seriously affect its merits as a philosophy. Others are far more important. The introduction to logic and the chapter on Being, need to be remodelled. Obscure passages, such as we have called attention to, should be made clear. The author's idea of what the style should be is well expressed in the preface : "It must be of a didactic nature, that is, brief and concise, but above all, perfectly clear." In carrying out this idea he has achieved only a moderate measure of success. Where he is obscure, it is in the ideas rather than in the words. These are, on the whole, good English words. Indeed the author affects a preference for words of Anglo-Saxon origin. But, like most foreigners, in dealing with such words he lacks the delicate instinct to appreciate their nice shades of meaning, and to apply them correctly. The book is full of inaccuracies, both of expression and statement ; mistakes of language and style which would be considered discreditable in one to whom English were not a foreign tongue. And what shall we say of his effort "to illustrate his theories by quotations from the poets, to lessen the tension of the mind by something pleasing and interesting?" We can at least give him credit for a good intention. It was certainly a "new departure" in a textbook of philosophy. And now that the experiment has been tried, we are "free to admit" that it is an unquestionable failure. With the exception of a few short lines, the quotations neither illustrate the theories nor lessen the tension of the mind. The theories are as easy to understand as the illustrations ; and the text is less of a strain than the poetry. We see no objection, as Fr. De Concilio proposes, "to mix the useful with the sweet." It is not an easy matter, however, to select from our didactic poets lengthy passages that will serve as illustrations of abstruse theories, and yet deserve to be called "sweet" poetry. An obscure proposition or argument is not made clear by the jingle of rhyme.

The chief merit of the "Elements," and it is no inconsiderable merit, lies in the skilful division and orderly arrangement of the subjects.

The chapters are not too comprehensive; the articles are sufficiently short; the subject-matter distinctly stated. It is true, we miss many points that might well have been introduced; some that might even be considered necessary. In this respect Father De Concilio's book is more meagre than Hill's *Elements*. But we have no desire to quarrel with it on that account. We cannot look for everything in an elementary treatise. And besides, where the outline is too bare, as it often is, it can be filled in by reference to the fuller treatment of the same subjects by Hill.

There is one article, the fourth in Chapter II. of Anthropology, which should have been omitted. It can serve no good purpose in a book intended for young persons; it may do much harm. We have heard it spoken of as positively indelicate. Let the reader imagine, if he can, a class of young ladies in one of our academies, presided over by a nun, discussing and commenting upon the subject of that article! Its treatment should be left to the special science to which it belongs. We hope, for the sake of decency, that in a second edition, this article will disappear.

It is the orderly arrangement of the subjects treated, that gives to this volume that degree of clearness which it retains in spite of its mistakes and inaccuracies, to which we do not pretend to have done full justice. If we have seemed to dwell upon its defects rather than its merits, it is because the former are scattered and need to be searched for in detail. But we have reviewed the book in no unfriendly spirit. We cheerfully acknowledge all the merit to which it can lay claim. Fr. De Concilio has undertaken to labor in a field which promises a plentiful harvest and in which there is room for many workmen. We wish him success in his enterprise. That his book has faults must be evident, we should suppose, even to the author. We think he will be thankful to us for giving him the opportunity of making the corrections which we have shown to be necessary. With such changes as we have suggested it can be made a useful book, especially for the pupils of female academies, and other students whose previous attainments may not have fitted them for a more thorough course of philosophy.

---

THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY EPOCH: being a history of France from the beginning of the First French Revolution to the end of the Second Empire. By *Henri Van Laun*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879. Two vols. 8vo.

THE French Revolution was only a phase, though the most conspicuous one, of the modern Revolution, or spirit of revolt and rebellion against God and all authority derived from Him. Most men of our day, some of them very honestly, imagine that it originated in a love of liberty and independence, developed by that culture, which grew out of the invention of printing and Luther's Reformation. If true liberty and independence of merely human control are meant, this is not true. For, the spirit of individual, municipal, civil, and national liberty was as well understood in the Middle Ages, as now; and we beg leave to add, though it may shock the ears of modern Liberals, better appreciated and far more extensively practiced than in our day. Liberty, as it is called, or Liberalism, as it should more properly be called—for it is not a virtue, nor a right, nor anything good and creditable—is with too many nowadays not independence of usurped or unlawful sway, but is simply a rebellion against God's authority or any authority derived from Him.

It is the spirit of Satan manifesting itself in those whom he has won over, and through them perpetuating the work he began with Eve and Adam in the earthly paradise. He promised them freedom from God's authority in order to enslave them the more securely. And this is the very spirit of modern Liberalism. It protests against authority, but it cunningly hides what is thereby meant, the authority of God or of those who hold from Him whether in the religious or secular sphere. It is willing to submit, nay glories in submitting, to any authority, provided it be not the authority of God or of those, with whom He has shared it. This is evident from the homage modern Liberals accord to whoever is the head of their party for the time being. And, if we look below the surface it is a thousand times more clearly seen in the oath-bound obedience which, in Europe at least, the members of secret societies give, not only without a murmur but with cheerfulness, to their hidden chief. They know not who he is, but they will commit any crime, even sacrilege, perjury, and murder at his bidding. This proves how hollow is the pretext, that they are fond of independence and striving to establish the principle of self-government. It is not thirty years, since a member of the "Marianne," a secret society in France, was commanded to assassinate his own mother. She was suspected of giving information to the police about the dark doings of her son; and at the next meeting of the Lodge, it was decreed that she had incurred the penalty of death. Her son was chosen to execute the sentence of the secret tribunal, not only to bind him closer by crime to his associates, but also with the diabolical intent of impressing upon him and others the terrible lesson that family, social, moral, religious, and other ties, are but gossamer threads, in comparison with the iron chains that bind the members of a secret society to the underground government to which he has once sworn allegiance. The fact we allude to cannot be called in question. For the son, though willing enough to commit the crime, proved practically no adept but a bungler, and, therefore, was caught, convicted, and guillotined. The whole history of his trial, and confession, with the evidence, may be seen in any French or European newspaper of any importance of the year 1853 or 1854, according to the best of our recollection.

The true history of this Revolution, above and below ground, has yet to be written. And M. Henri Van Laun is evidently not the man for the task. His so-called history is a pitiful, contemptible thing. His object is plain enough, to justify the upheaval of disorderly elements in Europe against the existing order of things. But he brings no historical talent to aid him in his sophistry. He has, whenever it suits his purpose, big words and phrases, but no attempt at logical deductions. "Priests and superstition," "priestly influence," "clerical party," these are the stereotyped phrases, with which he explains matters to his liking. He has an introduction, devoted to the period which prepared the way for the French Revolution. But it is neither correct nor philosophical, inasmuch as it dwells on the social and political miseries of France (which no doubt existed), but says nothing of the horrible spirit of irreligion which possessed the big cities and was making its way into the rural districts. And yet this, no doubt, in the eyes of any sound thinker, was one of the primary causes of the French Revolution.

If he is not competent to reason on facts, he is able enough to pervert or state them incorrectly. The American reader ought to feel indebted to him for the information (vol. 1. p. 490) that Spain was induced by Napoleon to sell Louisiana to the United States. Again (vol. 1. p. 399), it is boldly asserted from the lying French Republican rumors of

the day, that Gen. Duphot took refuge in the palace of the French Ambassador, Joseph Bonaparte, and that the Papal troops "fired on them and killed an attache of Gen. Duphot." This is said to justify the French Directory for its subsequent invasion and subjugation of Rome. But the story is false, and there yet live some who have heard the true account from those who were both eye-witnesses and parties to that portion of Roman history. The French Ambassador then lived in the Palace Corsini, under the Janiculum, and very little distant from the palace is an arched gateway, called Porta Settimiana, which opens on the Via Longara. On the north side of the gate, a little to the right hand (we could put our finger on the very spot), a picket station of three or four gendarmes with sentry box was placed by the government of Pius VI. Its object was to watch the headquarters of the Revolutionary propaganda in the Palace Corsini, where disaffected Romans celebrated their Masonic orgies, and prevent them from coming out to create riot and tumult in the city—a practice encouraged by all the embassies of the French Republic throughout Italy. What happened afterwards, showed the wisdom of the Papal government's provision. For on the 27th of December, 1797, after a dinner in the Palace Corsini, a horde of drunken vagabonds, French and Italian, issued from the palace, wearing tricolor cockades and shouting for the Republic, which was to take the place of the Pope's government. The miserable sneak, Joseph Bonaparte, was not with them, but he sent at their head his *attaché*, Gen. Duphot. Marching southward, they came very soon to the picket station at Porta Settimiana, where they were called to halt more than once by Corporal Marinelli, who had charge of the station. As they advanced in defiance of his repeated summons and warnings, he had no alternative but to do his duty as a soldier. He took deliberate aim at the epauletted miscreant, who headed this drunken band and shot him dead on the spot. The moment he fell, his followers fled in confusion. Three or four years before, a similar attempt had been made by a fanatical Frenchman, Hugues Bassville (likewise under the inspiration of the French embassy), but he too fell, a victim not of military discipline, but of popular indignation. To his death we owe one of Monti's poems, and perhaps his best (certainly one of the best that modern Italian poetry has produced), the "*Cantica in morte di Ugo Bassville*." When the French, under Berthier, seized Rome in 1798, Marinelli was compelled to hide himself, and it is to the credit of the faithful people of Rome that his hiding-place, though known to many, was never betrayed, until he emerged from it at the triumphant return of Pius VII. in 1814.

But though our author is ignorant of facts, he is very well posted in hidden motives of the human breast, and can tell us plainly enough of those secret springs that move a Pope to act, while he pretends others. "At first the Pope (Pius VII.) refused (to crown Napoleon) for various reasons, principally because he would not consecrate the usurper to a throne, to which there was a legitimate pretender. But the Pontiff's reluctance *may be more justly ascribed* to the wish of enhancing the price of this favor, and by these means to obtain once more possession of the Legations, Bologna, etc." (Vol. ii. p. 9.) He gives us as history the old stereotyped fable of Wellington's "Up, guards, and at them!" but when he comes to speak of the causes of the uprising of Belgium against Holland and her Nassau dynasty, he seems utterly ignorant that the atrocious anti-Catholic bigotry of the house of Orange was one of the chief causes. (Vol. ii. pp. 196, 297.)

The author is seemingly a Frenchman, and his English betrays it. See vol. ii. p. 227 for one example. He is a Republican and detests,

as heartily as we could wish, the two imperial shams, Napoleon I. and Napoleon III. But he has a word of excuse for every Republican ruffian or hero (so called) who figures in his pages, and sickens us by his frequent reminding us that they were "honest." And this even of Robespierre! He is no Catholic evidently, nor Christian of any kind, for he is indignant at the attempt of the Restoration (so he calls the government of Louis XVIII.), to enforce some kind of respect for the Sunday, as if it were an outrage upon the liberty of French *citizens*, for he would no doubt object to our calling them subjects. (Vol. ii. p. 154.)

His sources of information are not the best. He professes to draw from MM. Taine, Michelet, and Quinet, and from Carlyle. As if Carlyle were not the greatest of all modern shams, and MM. Taine, Michelet, and Quinet were not well known to be neither Christians nor honest men, if we must state the case plainly. They hate and fiercely abuse the Jesuits and the Catholic Church, and this is their passport to the favor of the non-Catholic world, which overlooks the fact that their abuse of Pope and Jesuits is their peculiar way of expressing their hatred of Christianity.

The book is a wretched performance, however we consider it, and does not deserve the name of a history. The author took some pains at the beginning, but the second volume, especially the latter half of it, seems to have been written under compulsion, merely to gratify the publisher's demand for promised copy. We would not have noticed it, were it not that we wished to warn Catholics against it, as we know that too many of them are apt to learn history from these worthless or pernicious sources.

DE RE SACRAMENTARIA. Prælectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticæ quas in Collegio SS. Cordis Jesu ad Woodstock maxima Soc. Jesu studiorum domo in Fœd. Americæ Sept. Statibus habebat A D. MDCCCLXXVII-VIII. *Æmilius M. De Augustinis*, S. J., in eodem Collegio Theol. Dogmaticæ Professor. Libri duo priores. Woodstock, Marylandiæ: Ex officina typographica Collegii. 1878. Large 8vo., pp. 755.

We have recommended already, and again beg leave to recommend this learned treatise of F. De Augustinis. There is no more important matter in dogmatic theology, none of wider extent; for a hundred practical questions arise every day which moral theology cannot solve without reference to dogma. God's grace is the life of the soul and the sacraments are the ordinary channels through which it is imparted. The sect that breaks loose from Catholic Unity, but does not deny or discard the sacraments, may be in general terms a rotten, withered branch, but secures thereby for such of her children as are in good faith the means of grace and multiplies their chances of salvation. Stagnation of the vital current is not always death, as we see in some examples of the Eastern Churches. But the Churches which have rejected the sacraments are all on the highroad to utter infidelity, if not already sunk in its abyss. The extinction of Christianity among them is only a question of time. Nothing is more striking than the difference between the fallen churches of the East and of the West in this respect. The subtle but indolent Eastern mind goes in one direction, the busy practical Western mind in another. The former will speculate and theorize, from doubt to denial, on all the higher mysteries of God's nature, the Trinity of Persons, or the wonderful fact of the Incarnation. But, in spite of all this it has the deepest reverence for the sacramental system of the Church. Hence the Nestorian or Eutychian, while denying the fundamental truths of the Incarnation, can see no difficulty, and will

think it no hardship to kneel down before a priest, confess his sins, and beg for absolution, or to adore the real presence of Christ our Lord in the Eucharist. But Western heresy is not apt to soar on metaphysical wings. It does not speculate about the nature and *mode* of the higher mysteries. It either simply admits them (not *believes* but *tolerates* them) or flatly denies them, as most "thinkers" outside of the Catholic Church now boldly do. But that God should have chosen visible channels to convey His invisible grace, is quite intolerable to the heretically inclined Westerns, especially those of the Teutonic race. It seems to them a waste of our time and of His power. They will not condescend to inquire whether He *has* done it. They boldly take the ground that He could not and would not, because their "private opinion" has decided that He ought not to do it.

F. De Augustinis follows substantially the same method, as his colleague, F. Mazzella. Of this he gives us a brief preliminary sketch in his introduction. Theology being chiefly based on authority, the first duty of a theological teacher is to state clearly what is the doctrine of the Church as defined by herself, accurately distinguishing and separating it from the opinions of the schools and of individual theologians (to which she accords great liberty), and then proving it clearly and convincingly from Holy Writ, and from the Tradition of the Church in all ages, of which Tradition the Holy Fathers are the chief witnesses and expounders. After this, which is, so to speak, the groundwork of theological science, he proceeds to construct the noble edifice. He explains the truths revealed by God and proposed to us by Holy Church, by the aid of sound reasoning, as far as they admit of explanation; or in the case of mysteries he shows how they transcend, but do not contradict natural reason. He further points out the connection and mutual bearing of revealed truths, and brings to light the analogies that exist between the doctrine of the Church and the teaching of reason; which of itself furnishes proof presumptive of the truth of both. To say that F. De Augustinis has done this well would be saying little; for he has carried out his programme with a completeness that deserves all praise.

Another advantage of the course of Fathers De Augustinis and Mazzella is, that, when necessary, they bring the latest teachings of Rome to bear on opinions, which have a Catholic look, but are not in strict conformity with the Catholic dogma. Thus on the last page of the volume before us there is a decision (of which we never heard before) issued in 1875, and condemning an insidious opinion of which the apparent intent was to lessen the difficulties of Transubstantiation, but, instead, did away with the doctrine.

We cordially recommend this book not only to all professors who have the leisure and the good will to improve themselves in that great science, which after the science of the Saints, best becomes a priest. Many are so absorbed in their continual onerous duties arising from the care of souls, that they have little time left for study. But all are not thus situated. And it would be a serious mistake for any of them to suppose that their education is finished, when they have left the ecclesiastical seminary or other house of clerical training. On the contrary, it is only then beginning in earnest. Let each one remember, that his intellectual powers are developing themselves constantly, and the knowledge that he laid up in his storehouse of memory is fermenting day by day, unconsciously taking new forms and striving to purge itself of all dross of error. He is now able to study for himself, and this is chiefly that for which the training of years under a professor was intended.

Let all our young clergy, who have the time and opportunity, give themselves to study; and the habit of studying will at last bring about a love of study, making it a pleasure instead of a task. Let them take up, for example, the works of F. De Augustinis and F. Mazzella and read a few pages every day or at regular intervals. They will soon be astonished and delighted by many things which are new to them, consequences that flow from dogmas or their underlying principles; in a word, much that never occurred to them before, but which they will clearly see was contained, as in its germ, in the knowledge they acquired in the seminary.

---

REPLY OF RT. REV. THOMAS A. BECKER, D.D., BISHOP OF WILMINGTON, to assertions against the Catholic Church made, by Bishop Lee, of the Anglican denomination, in a Sermon delivered in St. Andrew's, Wilmington, Del., Oct. 28th, 1878. *Non nova sed nove.* Baltimore Sun Office, 1878, pp. 35.

There was lately held at Lambeth Palace, England, a Pan-Anglican Synod, that is, an assembly of English-speaking churchmen, designated as bishops by themselves and their co-religionists. Even Catholics, though not recognizing their orders as valid, do not refuse them the appellation, as far as courtesy in civil or social life requires it. But our courtesy, extorted by Christian charity, which for the moment suppresses or thrusts out of sight our positive convictions, is ill-repaid by these gentlemen. For there is scarce one of them who can ever speak of us without using the offensive epithets, Popish, Papist, Romanist, etc. Was it out of the simplicity of his good heart or in a sarcastic vein that Rev. Mr. Nightingale, an English Methodist clergyman, wrote in a book published some fifty years ago, that "these odious nicknames of Papist and Romanist are no longer applied to the Roman Catholic Church by any scholar or gentleman?"

Why these bishops called their assemblage a synod, it would be hard to say. For they decided nothing, agreed to nothing that concerned faith, morals or church discipline. The Catholic Church, to whom they are indebted for the very name of synod, has been holding synods for the last eighteen hundred years; but their object was always to settle something in faith or discipline. Unity of faith comes from the teaching power of the Church; unity of discipline, as far as it may be needed or desirable, from the law-making power left her by Christ. And this is just the difference between the Church and the sects. The latter have neither authority to teach nor to legislate. And they often, though not always, confess it. The Pan-Anglican Synod did homage to the truth from the very beginning by declaring that it "could not assume to exercise any legislative authority."

Bishop Lee, of Delaware, having returned home from this synod, which did nothing and by its own honest confession could do nothing, was naturally expected by his people to say something of the synod. But what could he say of a synod that had done nothing? He had to fall back on the old ground, that is always a safe retreat for the embarrassed pulpit orator. Sterne used to say of himself, that when at a loss for matter in his sermons, he always fell back on his "Cheshire cheese," abuse of Popery. Bishop Lee did the same, and proceeded to attack and vilify the Catholic religion, which according to him was not religion, but "Paganism, a soul-crushing, soul-blighting despotism, a spurious, unchristian faith," etc.

It was this sermon that elicited the reply by Bishop Becker. It fully demolishes all the charges of Bishop Lee, and is a most able defence of all those points on which he attacked the Church. The arguments in



reply to those charges are old and stereotyped like the charges themselves. But Bishop Becker has given them the charm of novelty and freshness, and has succeeded admirably in carrying out the motto of his title page: *Non nova sed nove.*

---

PROTESTANT AND CATHOLIC CIVILIZATION COMPARED. The Future of Catholic Peoples. An Essay contrasting Protestant and Catholic efforts for Civilization. By *Baron de Haulleville*. With Prefatory Notes, by Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Dechamps, and Pius IX., and an Appendix, containing Notes from various authoritative sources. New York: Hickey & Co., Publishers of the Vatican Library. 1879.

This work, from the pen of the learned and able editor of the *Révue Générale*, of Brussels, is a vindication of an arraignment of the Church as regards her influence upon civilization, made by M. Emile de Laveleye, the literary leader of Liberalism in Belgium, editor of the *Révue de Belgique*, and an occasional contributor to the *Fortnightly Review*.

The author shows that nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that the material prosperity of a people is conclusive evidence of the truth of its religious belief; and, even if this were true, it would be fatal to every form of worship ever practiced by man. Again, Catholic nations *have* attained to the topmost height of worldly greatness, and it was only when they ceased to be truly Catholic that they lost their splendor. On the other hand, where, we might ask, has a people ever been great because it was Protestant? What did the ephemeral glory of Sweden, Holland, and Prussia, avail them? England is great in spite of Protestantism, and because of the principle of liberty handed down from the Catholic ages—the Ages of Faith. Was it Lutheranism that conquered at Sedan? Would it not be more natural to suppose that the social convulsion which is now shaking the German Empire to its very foundations, is directly traceable to the principles of the so-called Reformation? Nor is the comparison on economical grounds, in any respect more advantageous to Protestant communities. Where they are prosperous it is not on account of their religion, but owing to local influences; whereas, even in Protestant Prussia, Catholics have, by their industry, overcome the disadvantages of nature to such an extent as to have honestly gained for themselves the reputation of being the most thrifty people in Europe, or perhaps in the world.

We give here but a faint outline of the subjects treated in detail by Baron de Haulleville, in the first three chapters of his work. The fourth, which treats of colonization, will, perhaps, be the most interesting to American readers. How the Catholic Church has always been the friend of civil liberty is shown in the fifth, and more than one delusion concerning education is dispelled in the sixth chapter. The subject of immorality is one on which Protestants, and, in fact, non-Catholics generally, have every reason to keep silent; for, Protestantism more than any other heresy, was inspired by lust. And even to-day, in this enlightened nineteenth century, we find Protestant communities wallowing in the most degrading kinds of vice. The statistics furnished in corroboration of this statement are of the most conclusive kind, and cannot fail to leave the impression on every unbiassed mind, that the "Reformation" has been anything but a blessing to the peoples upon whom it was forced by tyrannical rulers. The development of the Protestant principle can bring nothing but ruin.

The work is enriched with an appendix, containing, in the form of statistical and historical facts, ample corroborations of Baron de Haulleville's arguments. It is well printed and neatly bound.

THE JESUITS. By *Paul Feval*. Translated from the French, by T. F. Galwey. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1879.

Years ago, when just entering upon his literary life, and an indifferentist as regards religious belief, the author of this work was solicited by the proprietor of a leading Paris newspaper to prepare a series of articles in denunciation of the Society of Jesus. Assenting to the proposal, a mass of material, much of it new and unpublished, was placed in his hands; he examined and studied it. The result was an unexpected change in his opinions of the Order. He found himself, to his utter astonishment, on the one hand, compelled by the very testimony of those who had been its accusers to acquit it of the misdeeds and crimes which they had charged it, and, on the other hand, convinced of their malice, falsehood, and hypocrisy. The manliness of his nature revolted from the task he had undertaken, and he revoked his contract. The study of the documents referred to, made a deep impression on his mind; for, though during a period of thirty years he remained an indifferentist, he tells us that he "continued to think of the Jesuits in spite of himself, and read with a strange eagerness whatever bore upon them," until after many years "God sought him out, allowed unaccustomed sorrow to fall upon him, cast him to the dust, and, in that solemn moment, when the soul hesitates and shivers, called on the one side, by repentance and life, and on the other by revolt and death. He sent the Jesuit, Pierre Olivaint, to assist him, to touch the crucifix to his pains and lift him out of despair."

With a heart full of gratitude to God for his conversion, our author has set himself to work to counteract and repair, as best he may, the evil done by his pen in the years of his irreligion. He confesses that he "has sown his long road with pages in which the name of God is dubiously honored, religion received but an empty respect," and of which he can "scarcely read one with unmixed pleasure." The first of his publications in the cause of his holy faith is entitled *Les Etapes d'une Conversion*. The present volume, which is but the precursor of a third, *The General History of the Jesuits*, upon which he is laboring, is the second.

The object of the author is not to present a history of the labors of the Society, or a studied vindication of it from the assaults of its enemies, but simply "to hold its members up as spectacles before the eyes of men," whom it calls upon to come and see what manner of men they are, the nature of the wicked deeds with which they have been charged, the character of their accusers, and "the justice with which they have been subjected to the universal scorn and derision of the world. "It asks the same question concerning them that was formerly asked concerning our Lord, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" and returns the same answer, "Come and see."

With glowing pen our author sketches the foundation of the Society by St. Ignatius Loyola. We see before us, as in a painting, the warrior of Pampeluna, marshalling his little army of Jesus upon the heights of Montmartre. Then we behold him kneeling humbly at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, and entreating his benediction upon the society and its formal recognition. This obtained, we behold crowds flocking to its standard and enlisting in its service; some founding schools and universities; others combating the errors of the day; and still others, girding their loins and grasping their staves, speeding their way over stormy seas and through uninhabited deserts to the distant regions of America, Asia, Africa, and the isles of the ocean, everywhere triumphing over superstition and false religion, everywhere fertilizing the soil with their

blood, and everywhere making it blossom as the garden of their Lord. Then the scene changes, and we are brought back to the civilized countries of France, and Spain, and Portugal. There we behold the standard of persecution raised against the society. We see infidel philosophers and encyclopædists envious of the success of its schools and universities, courtiers and courtesans of corrupt courts illy enduring the rebuke of their misdeeds, lucre-loving tradesmen angered because the missionaries of the society interfered to protect from their dishonesty and cruelty the poor ignorant savages. We see all these enemies of the society rallying their forces for its destruction, and uniting, with satanic malevolence, in aspersing and calumniating its members. We see its members cast into subterranean dungeons, placed on board of leaking and sinking vessels, and suffering death at the hands of the public executioner. And finally, when malevolence and hatred reigned supreme, and the peace of Christendom seems to require it, we see the Society of Jesus, obedient to the decree of the Sovereign Pontiff, disbanding and ceasing to exist.

These sketches, drawn with a master-hand, furnish a powerful defence of the Society of Jesus against the aspersions of its enemies, who are made to stand before us in their true character, self-confessed hypocrites, liars, and unwilling vindicators of the innocence of those whose condemnation their malice and hatred had secured.

The work has obtained the almost universal commendation of the Catholic press, and we cordially give it the benefit of this expression of our favorable opinion.

THE LIFE OF HENRIETTE D'OSSEVILLE. (In Religion, Mother Ste. Marie.) Foundress of the Institute of the Faithful Virgin. Arranged and edited by *John George McLeod* of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

This very interesting book has a special value for those who are engaged in the work of educating and taking care of Catholic orphans. Madame d'Osseville was one of those remarkable instances in which God shows pre-eminently his power in selecting instrumentalities, according to the judgment of man, not only insufficient, but ill adapted to the great work performed through them. Of a delicate physical constitution, she was affected with curvature of the spine and kindred diseases all her life; she was physically deformed, and suffered from great weakness of body and from agonizing pains, yet she was enabled to found, and for many years, up to extreme old age, to direct, with extraordinary efficiency and success, an Institute or Congregation held in high esteem, which has expanded into a number of houses in France and England, for the care of orphans. The history of her undertaking was marked at first by the obstacles, delays, and bitter disappointments with which God usually tries the faith and patience of those whom he selects for some specially important and blessed work. The solid virtue, too, of the infant congregation was tested in two opposite ways. It had been scarcely formed when Divine Providence called it to a most arduous work, not its own, the attendance on the sick during a most terrible visitation of cholera. Soon afterwards it was summoned to the still more trying task of tending for a time the wounded soldiers in the Crimea. These were entirely different works from that for which the Congregation was founded, the special charge of protecting and educating orphans of the poorer class, and seemed a strange training and discipline. Had it not been for the firm and watchful rule of the holy Foundress, directed with a pure and single intention to the one great

object of her life, her Institute might have been easily drawn aside from its special vocation.

These incidents and many other topics we have not mentioned, connected with the spiritual trials and experiences of Madame d'Osseville are narrated in this work.

A HISTORY OF MARYLAND, UPON THE BASIS OF MCSHERRY. By *Henry Onderdonk, A.M.* Second Revised and Enlarged Edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., pp. 360.

This book is gotten up in simple style for the use of schools. The author has done his work of condensing McSherry conscientiously and creditably. About one hundred and fifty pages of the book are of his own composing. They refer to the late war, and are not the least interesting portion. The author has treated the Merryman Case in a very agreeable manner. We would like to see condensed estimates of the true worth of such men among Maryland's sons as Chief Justice Taney. The history is done up in the old style of narrating battles and wars. We submit that this is becoming antiquated. The inner life of Maryland is of much more importance; but we get glimpses of it "few and far between" in the book under review. We understand that the book has been regarded as too decidedly Catholic. We think it is all the other way, inasmuch as it is too negative on Catholic issues. What a glowing chapter, for instance, might be written for our Catholic youth upon the lives of the first noble missionaries! And a chapter upon education in Maryland would have much to say upon the flourishing Catholic institutions that dot the State. Then there are the numerous religious Orders, which are certainly deserving of a more than passing notice. These are precisely the things our Catholic youth ought not be kept in ignorance of. The day is past when a Catholic need fear to hold up his head and speak out the truth. The history of the Church in the United States is a glorious proof of its undying vitality.

LAST SEVEN WORDS OF JESUS ON THE CROSS. By a *Passionist Missionary Priest*. Permissu Superiorum. New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher, 1877.

Volumes have been written and volumes more might be written on the "Last Words" of our Divine Lord while hanging on the cross, without exhausting their meaning. They form a most fruitful subject for devout meditation. Those who seek to be perfect, and those, too, whose aspirations are less high, but who still sincerely desire to overcome temptation and fight the good fight of faith, can find no better spiritual exercise than devout meditation on these Last Words. For, as is well remarked in the work before us, "our Divine Master during his whole life was a most perfect model of all Christian virtues; and like a bright lamp the splendor of His example shone most brilliantly at the close of His life, during His three hours' agony on the golden candlestick of His holy cross." "The last words of every great personage are treasured by all his relations, friends, and admirers. This particularly is the case with the dying expressions of persons eminent for sanctity. But who can be greater than the King of kings, and the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth? Who can be more holy than Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the source of all grace, virtue, and sanctity? He is our Creator, our best Benefactor, our wisest Teacher, our most faithful Friend, our nearest Relative, our Brother, our Father, our Redeemer, our All."

In his exposition of the seven sentences spoken by our Saviour on the

cross, commonly called His "Seven Last Words," the author of the work before us makes the following general division :

"The first three words of our crucified Redeemer have relation to men upon earth. The four last words relate more immediately to Himself. The former represent our Saviour as the most perfect model of good example. The latter represent Him as the most perfect victim of our atonement, and as the full price of our redemption : *Copiosa apud Deum redemptio.*"

Each "Consideration" is concluded with a devout and appropriate prayer. The work throughout is full of edifying and devout thoughts, and constitutes an excellent help towards understanding the profound and most important truths comprehended in the passion and death of our Divine Lord.

---

A SHORT CATECHISM FOR YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN CONTEMPLATING MARRIAGE. By Michael Dausch, Secular Priest of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Printed at St. Mary's Industrial School for Boys, Carroll P. O., Baltimore County, Md. 1878.

One of the most fruitful causes of the scandals which mark our age, and of life-long misery even where it does not give rise to public scandal, is the rashness and wrong dispositions with which so many persons contract marriage. This is not only the cause of misery and of sin in countless instances, but is wrong in itself. St. John Chrysostom says : "Whenever you are about to take a wife, read not only the laws of the land, but, more than these, consider those of the Church ; for by these, and not by those of the State, will God judge you in that day." Matrimony is a sacrament of the Church sanctifying the relation of husband and wife, and strengthening them for the discharge of the duties of the holy relation into which they have entered.

Catholics living in constant contact with, and often in, the families of Protestants and other non-Catholics, are in great danger of forgetting this, and of insensibly adopting the wrong and loose ideas of matrimony which prevail outside the Church.

The little work before us is designed to guard young persons against this, and to instruct them in the dispositions they should have, and the preparation they should make, for entering into the marriage relation, so as to preserve its sacred character, and faithfully discharge the duties it involves. Father Dausch's work is put forth with the *imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore. In the form of question and answer, it gives plain, practical, and important instructions in regard to the various subjects on which it treats. It is a timely and useful work, and we would be glad to see it in the hands of all young Catholics. Married persons, also, may derive from its pages useful instruction and practical hints how they may avoid the unhappiness which frequently arises in families from want of consideration, ill-judgment, ill-temper, the absence of the dispositions which religion inculcates and encourages, and from other causes.

---

RAPHAELA; OR, THE HISTORY OF A YOUNG GIRL WHO WOULD NOT TAKE ADVICE. By *Mlle Monot*. Translated from the French, by a Sister of St. Joseph. Philadelphia : Peter F. Cunningham & Son, 29 South Tenth Street. 1878.

A most charmingly written and interesting sketch of the life, useful labors, and charity of a French lady, born in affluence and high station, who passed safely through the perils of the "days of terror," and though exposed to the insidious influences of the corrupt social life of France in high circles, preserved her faith, led an eminently Christian life, devoting herself in her latter years to the establishment of a highly successful educational institution.

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

Vol. IV.—APRIL, 1879.—No. 14.

---

## THE OUTLOOK, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL, IN EUROPE.

**I**F we review the events of the past twelve months, a series of criminal attacks on the lives of sovereigns in Europe arrests our attention. Twice within a few weeks the assassination of the Emperor William, of Germany, was attempted. Thereupon bills, designed to suppress the socialistic movement, were introduced into the then sitting Parliament, and when it refused to pass them its dissolution was ordered. New elections took place, the Parliament assembled and finally sanctioned the anti-socialist bill. It was put into operation with rigorous severity, and is now in full force. Yet still socialism, which is aiming at nothing less than the overthrow of "the powers that be," continues to infect the whole German Empire. In Italy, the discovery of a plot against King Humbert's life, led to the adoption of stringent measures to stay the farther growth and aggressions of the secret revolutionary societies which infest that kingdom throughout its entire extent. Turning to Russia, we find despotism there grappling with a sinister foe, "Nihilism." Murders shrouded in impenetrable mystery, agitate St. Petersburg and Moscow, and in all their appalling atrocity still live fresh in memory. The autocratic power of the North has concentrated all its energies upon the suppression of this internal and fatal force, and the partial closing of the Russian Universities must be regarded as a necessary measure of precaution which the government has been compelled to adopt for the avoidance of more violent and greater collisions than have already occurred. Only a few months ago the cabinet of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was informed by the secret police of Berlin of the existence of a conspiracy against

the life of Emperor Francis Joseph. There is every reason to believe that this timely warning alone prevented in Vienna an occurrence similar to, and, perhaps, more tragical than the one "Unter den Linden," in Berlin. In Spain, likewise, the young King Alfonso has been threatened with a premature end by the hand of an assassin, and the scaffold on which the would-be murderer paid the penalty for his crime is still warm with his blood. Attack followed attack in rapid succession. And if an isolated occurrence, the object of which consists in taking the life of a crowned head, may be regarded as of serious importance, then an array of facts, like those before us, certainly has a formidable significance.

For some time past it has been evident to all reflecting minds that we live in a period the near future of which is fraught with dangers of the gravest character. We seem, indeed, to be on the eve of a social upheaval, which threatens to be of unprecedented magnitude, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the whole civilized world is more or less confronted with problems, the solution of which threatens the welfare and peace of human society. Those who can and do read the "signs of the times," have not failed to perceive unmistakable indications of decay, if not of dissolution. They note with apprehension and alarm the premonitory warnings which invariably precede the outbreak of most destructive tempests. Within the last year the situation has become such as must disabuse even the optimist of his dreams, and compel even the skeptic to believe in the gravity of the political and social condition of Europe. France, in 1789, raised a cry for "liberty, equality, and fraternity," and since then this cry has constantly resounded over all continental Europe. For upwards of eighty years the ideas called into life by that great revolution have been at work, silently making proselytes, and the results are now before the world.

If we wish to understand the crisis, it will not suffice to acquire a merely superficial knowledge of the startling theories of the day. It is also necessary to examine into their real nature and essence. The doctrines which cause uneasiness in all social and political circles are not apparitions of to-day; they have a genesis, a growth and a mature development. We propose, therefore, in this paper, to ascertain the sources from which they have sprung, rather than merely to describe their present form.

The drift of communistic ideas was so graphically illustrated during the siege of Paris that it seems waste of time and space to enter now upon their discussion. Socialism, the menacing danger of Germany, presents, it is true, a less hideous aspect than the monstrous head of the "Commune;" but it converges, nevertheless, in its ultimate consequences, into communism. In fact,

this is found to be the case with all the "isms," when thoroughly examined. They have, all alike, a decidedly destructive tendency; they aim at the abolition of authority, at the overthrow of the present governments, at the demolition of the existing social and political order. What they propose is, in short, the emancipation of man from all those restrictions which society necessarily imposes upon man as a social being. The only possible means by which this grand result can be accomplished is, of course, a general revolution, doing away completely, once and forever, with the old order of things, and then society will have to be reconstructed on an entirely new basis.

It is not uninteresting here to observe how arguments abound as long as the necessity of pulling down is under discussion, but when that part of the process is reached where the work of rebuilding ought to be explained, diligent search generally reveals but—a vacuum. The identity of the end indicates an identical starting-point, and there is in reality one common principle which underlies all the modern doctrines. They vary only in their own formulations, and these slight diversities are easily explained by the preponderance of certain differing circumstances where they originated and first obtained. The various characters of nations have imprinted characteristic marks upon them. But apart from these purely accidental differences, the underlying principle of all is, as we have said, but one, and constitutes what has been called, with a good deal of sarcastic humor, "the creed of the nineteenth century," namely, the abolition of religion as belief in a supernatural order, and its replacement by the cultus of society.

Thus, we hear, on one side, complaints that the tide of infidelity which has set in, threatens in its onward flow to destroy religion; while, on the other side, it is urged that religion is an institution which has outlived its time, and must not be allowed to stand in the way of modern science. Modern science, we are told, diffuses light, frees from bigoted prejudice and places man on the firm ground of intelligence and reason, elevating him into a sphere where he soars with mighty wings above the narrowing influences of creeds and the debasing fear of eternity.

The intellectual hunger of the nineteenth century for knowledge cannot be satisfied with the husks of religious superstition. Science, it is urged, frees man from the bondage in which mind has been held and loosens the fetters which for centuries prevented him from advancing to the place to which his intellect entitles him in creation. Science restores him to liberty, because it restores him to reason. Therefore science transforms the slave into a freeholder, and man into the lord of creation. Behold, it is said, how scientific progress undermines the very foundations on which religion



stands, how doctrine after doctrine disappears as a mere phantom before that clear light which banishes all darkness; behold, how that ghost "revelation" dwindles and shrinks into nothing before the brilliant rays of scientific knowledge, which rests not on superstition, nor on speculation, but on the firmer and stronger ground of matters of fact.

Here we have a synopsis of the line of argument followed by modern free-thought, as we find it embodied in the startling theories of the times. Mankind is exhorted to discard henceforth all narrow-mindedness and to adopt, in keeping with the spirit of the age, the broad, liberal views of modern progress. There is, indeed, a fascination in the language and a certain ingenuity in the way by which the leading spirits of modern thought allure the masses. Their arguments are plausible, and seem to superficially thinking minds to rest on true premises. Then, too, the temptations held out to the multitude are great and often prove irresistible. It has always been a distinguishing feature of the great bulk of mankind to accept, nay, to embrace willingly and without questioning, doctrines which meet half-way, as it were, their own wishes and desires. Now, the abolition of Deity means, beyond all doubt, if it means anything, freedom from responsibility; and this exemption from accountability implies full sway to passion and desire. Then, again, we must not forget how our passions are ever ready to serve us an ill turn, and to call to their aid our imperfect or superficial knowledge. In preceding ages the masses, we grant readily, possessed less knowledge than they now have; but a multitudinous and hence, in most cases, a very superficial knowledge, is at best a possession of questionable value. Pope says, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and this, it seems to us, is precisely the kind of knowledge which prevails in our days. We must remember that even the scientific man who omits to make experience his guide—as many men of science in our day, unfortunately, are but too apt to do—will wander in the regions of idle speculation and sink into the quicksands of skepticism. Denham's

"Can knowledge have no bounds, but must advance  
So far as make us wish for ignorance?"

explains to a certain extent the prevalence of error. The "spherical expansion" of the human intellect, and not expansion in one direction only, as demanded by Fichte, implies that our knowledge is incomplete unless we supplement the results of our own line of research by knowledge drawn from other sources, made accessible to us by the labors of others. Yet here, we believe, we have reached the reason why modern science introduces a grating dis-

cord into the harmony of the universe. Every student who devotes himself to science must unquestionably select a single subject for the exercise of his own faculties for original investigation, "one line," as Professor Tyndall says, "along which he may carry the light of private intelligence a little way into the darkness by which all knowledge is surrounded." Thus the mathematician ought to restrict his labors to the relation of space and numbers; the astronomer to resolving the stellar masses and determining planetary movements; the biologist, to the conditions and phenomena of life; the chemist, to the atoms of matter, their combinations, affinities and reactions; and the disciple of the physical sciences, to the discovery of the laws which regulate the optical, acoustic, magnetic and electric phenomena. Each science in its advance is benefited in a greater or less degree by the advance made in others, and "spherical expansion" requires the student to take cognizance of this progress. Greatness and ability in one department, however, by no means involve greatness and ability in another. And since this is true in departments of knowledge that are closely related to each other, with how much greater force must it not apply when, by a total misconception of "spherical expansion," men of science leave their sphere altogether and venture upon ground which they cannot and, as a matter of fact, do not, know? The natural sciences have invaded the territory of metaphysics; no branch of science appears to consider itself complete nowadays, until it has forced an entrance into the vexed ocean of theology. *There*, it is, of course, a failure; but the failure becomes all the more deplorable, because this departure into realms in which it has no right to rule, realms unknown and unexplorable by it, influences in a most pernicious way the drift of thought amongst the masses.

As an instance, we take the theory of evolution. Prof. Huxley's merit as a physicist stands unquestioned. The theory of evolution, as long as confined to the physical order, is an admirable triumph of scientific research. It acquires an unscientific, and, therefore, dangerous character only when it is pushed beyond its legitimate bounds. Prof. St. George Mivart has very ably proved that the assertion of the evolution of new species is perfectly consistent with the strictest Christian theology; that there can be no conflict between evolution and revelation, since creation, "in potentia" does not imply creation "in actu." Evolution from matter into spirit is, however, by the intrinsic nature of both, an absolute impossibility, for which reason it has well been styled "scientific lunacy." But how many minds, let us ask, have sufficient quickness and power of penetration, sufficient perspicuity of thought, to perceive the exact extent to which the theory may legitimately be accepted, and where, exactly and why, it becomes repugnant to reason? We presume

their number is very limited. A great many read about the theory of evolution, and regard it as a deathblow to religion and the supernatural order. As a natural consequence, they begin to doubt whether, after all, the Christian ideas of God, of man's origin, of a world to come, etc., are not wrong, and require, at the very least, reconstruction. From that condition to atheism, there is but one step. The philosopher, the man of science, the highly educated portion of human society, are not so easily misled; but multitudes always have and always will blindly follow their leaders, and when once started, they often go farther than their leaders themselves. And, indeed, when we consider that it requires the consummate skill of a ripe scholar, and not the imperfect knowledge of a tyro, to discover false logic, and to lay open the fallacies of false conclusions, we can hardly wonder at the readiness with which the great majority of persons have appropriated the new, and, at first sight, attractive doctrines of modern physical and sociological scientists, and we can understand why the masses are now completely captivated and led willingly along the way to their own perdition. If the belief in God and His revelation is once shaken, it is soon and easily cast aside altogether. Defect of education, injudicious training, and want of judgment, co-operate to make the bulk of the people at first unconscious receptacles of rationalism and skepticism, and afterwards fanatical adherents of communism and socialism.

To the causes already mentioned, we must now add another fact, which is, the wonderful facilities for propagating knowledge in our times. Our age is the age of steam and electricity. And steam and electricity are both subservient to the press. A few generations ago it took comparatively a very long time before a theory left the study of the savant, and became common property of the many. Not so in our days. The telegraph and the press enable us to read a lecture four hours after its delivery, hundreds and thousands of miles away. True, in most cases, the information imparted consists only of a brief summary; but the few leading thoughts that are given, are caught, and they are, moreover, believed on the strength of the established standing of those who utter them. In this way, then, the "creed of the nineteenth century" has spread and permeated and saturated human society to an alarming extent. The disaster lies mainly in the disproportion in which a pernicious hypothesis affects "les hommes qui savent" and "les hommes qui ne savent pas." We are not prepared to call a Huxley, a Darwin, a Herbert Spencer, atheists. They share, we think, largely the feelings of Physicus, who writes:

"For inasmuch as I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the 'new faith' is a desirable substitute for the waning splendor of the 'old,' I am not ashamed to confess that, with this virtual negation of God,

the universe has lost to me its soul of loveliness. And when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence, as now I find it, at such times I shall ever find it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible."

The bravado of defiant arrogance is often but the mask of a sinking heart. The first-rate men of science have been misled by science misapplied. Science correctly applied, may lead them eventually back. But science is not a possible remedy for the many who have gone astray through the fault of the few.

When the masses have once quaffed of that delicious elixir of life, the "creed of the nineteenth century," they may be said to enter upon a stage of intoxication where every successive step seems to be certain and right.

Their reasoning is logical, and if the correctness of the premises could be granted, it would be impossible to find fault with the deductions drawn from them. If there is no hereafter, then, most assuredly, man looks forward in vain to it for the equalization and proper adjustment of the inequalities of this world. If our life ends forever with the term of our terrestrial existence, then surely we would be guilty of egregious folly if we looked to a future life as that where the unquenchable desire for happiness, the prime motor of all human action, will be gratified. But inequalities in the conditions of life do exist; they are realities. So, too, does the desire for happiness exist and clamor for satisfaction. What is more natural, therefore, than that those who have lost their belief in a world to come, should turn to this world and demand from it attainment of happiness, as well as a more equitable distribution of the conditions of comfortable existence? If we are exactly on the same level with the brute, which is born, lives, dies, and therewith ceases to exist, why should we have less enjoyment than the brute? And, again, why should the poor fail to perceive and note the superior advantages for the satisfaction of earthly desires and the attainment of earthly happiness which the wealthy possess? If there is nothing beyond the grave, why should not the poor relieve his miserable, wretched condition by appropriating to himself a part of the surplus riches of his wealthy neighbor? Enticing dreams of ease and luxury and pleasure and enjoyment begin to fill the imagination of the pauper, and the more he broods the stronger grows his conviction that he only proposes what is just when he demands a division of the riches of the world. As a child, perhaps, he entertained some notions of a God who rewards the righteous and punishes the unjust. Cast into the turmoil of life these notions gradually drift out of his mind; and in proportion as he discards them, in like proportion the intensity of his yearnings increase, and

make him the prey and the victim of communistic and socialistic ideas of the worst type. Yet, before long, he discovers that his imagined rights, upon which he bases his claims for radical changes in the social order, do not coincide at all with what the government under which he lives regards as his rights; and at every turn he finds himself in collision with the "powers that be." This state of affairs sets him to reasoning again. He asks, what right has man to command man? What obedience can man exact from man except the obedience compelled by superior force?

Authority ceases to be authority if its title is not derived from God, and how can that be anything else than a baseless pretension, since there is no God? Thus, governments become in his eyes the instrumentalities by which the ruling few utilize, for the furtherance of their own ends, the many. The formidable machine, "the State," is merely devised to keep the many in subjection, that by their labors they may promote the happiness of the few. Now, the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" reaches his ear, and he shrinks no longer from trying his strength in an issue, the result of which in his opinion, will be an amelioration of his condition.

We have thus tried to give a fair description of the process by which the doctrines of the day have come to menace the peace and welfare of society, and here we must remark, that it is an erroneous idea that violent socialistic and communistic ideas are endemic to all large and impoverished bodies of laborers. Poor people may be discontented; but their poverty alone does not make them dangerous. They become dangerous only when the discontent arises from the belief that their case might be relieved, if the governing classes had but the will to do it. The anxiety to overturn the existing order proceeds only from the belief that the miseries of the multitude are not due to the inability of any human agency to destroy suffering and sorrow, but are caused solely by criminal indifference on the part of the government, which might aid, but will not.

There is no need to go any farther into an examination of the several "isms" which unfortunately have acquired such widespread popularity. We have shown their common anatomy, have furnished the key, so to speak, which enables us to decipher them all. The abolition of supernatural religion, which is equivalent to the abolition of God, notwithstanding its inherent and immense absurdity, engenders and logically produces the perilous, pernicious theories of our times. And the gravity of the political and social situation is, therefore, directly traceable to the "creed of the nineteenth century," from which we have found that the destructive tendencies of modern society logically result. The storehouse of human society contains a vast amount of inflammable material; a

single spark thrown into it may cause a huge conflagration. The question now is, will the fermenting mass of humanity have long to wait for a pretext, to inaugurate a general movement for the destruction of authority?

The several governments of Europe are already seriously addressing themselves to the task of averting it. They are trying to remove the inflammable and explosive materials and to acquire absolute control over the unruly elements that have accumulated to an alarming extent in the ranks of the masses.

We turn, therefore, from the contemplation of the evils which are menacing society to the contemplation of the forces which are engaged in eradicating those evils.

What are the duties and obligations of governments? How do the governments of to-day acquit themselves of these duties and obligations? Are the principles of modern governments in harmony with the immutable principles which the philosophy of history inculcates as indispensable conditions of order, of power, and of stability? These are grave questions and they challenge attention, if the foreshadowings of the future in the present are more than mere idle conjectures. In order to answer these questions we must make a diversion into the past and ask: Has history a law? In other words, are the events which make up history really connected with each other, and are they in their causative principles the combined action of a Divine Providence and of human liberty, —or are they a conglomeration of facts that reproduce themselves haphazard in time and space?

Now history is certainly not an aimless, purposeless movement, nor a mere mechanical ceaseless surging to and fro of human atoms; on the contrary it is full of life and of intelligent purpose. It is a movement born, which will one day reach its end, but which, *en route* and in proportion as it advances, indicates to us the past and foreshadows the future—what has been and what will be. It is a witness and at the same time a prophet; and, therefore, it is an unailing source of instruction, for religion itself forms part of it. If we search all ages, from earliest antiquity down to the beginning of the Christian era, and continuing from there through nineteen hundred years to our own days, we find that man at all times has been confronted by the same mysteries which now confront him. Whence do we come? Where do we go? What is our destiny? These mysterious problems in all ages have clamored for solution, and in all ages religion has found it her special province to satisfy man on these all-important points. Hence it is that, whenever and wherever in history man is encountered, it is always as a religious being; for what is religion, but the expression by the human race of its innate consciousness of dependence upon a Supreme Being?

Proudhon, in *The Confessions of a Revolutionist*, has the following sentence: "It is surprising to observe how we find all our political questions complicated with theological questions."

This, however, is not surprising to one who knows from history that religion in all ages has been regarded as the indestructible foundation of human society. Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, the master-minds of Greece, hold with Cicero, Cato, and Plutarch the belief "that it is easier to build a city in the air than to establish human society without belief in God." Their opinion stands not alone, and we select almost at random from the works of Rousseau, and even of Voltaire, passages confirming the opinion. The former observes "that a state never was founded without religion as its basis." The latter says, "that religion on all accounts is necessary wherever human society exists." We conclude, therefore, on the unanimous testimony of all ages, that one of the main functions of the State consists in protecting and fostering religion.

Apart, however, from the cumulative evidence of history, the duty of any government to defend and uphold religion among its subjects results also from an analysis of the purpose and object of government; and, moreover, as we shall see, it is not an optional or accidental function, but an obligatory and essential duty from which there can be no exemption. If it is conceded that human society constitutes what is called the social order, and again, that the social order is the proper sphere of political science, then it is evidently the office of the State to establish and maintain those conditions under which society alone can prosper and move forward on the road towards self-perfection. The social order, in its turn, is made up of individuals, and the individuals, finally, are composed of body and soul. On account of this dual nature, and the constant conflict between the two elements, the predominance of the spiritual over the animal part of human nature is not only desirable but necessary in the individual, for only thereby can the animal passions and desires be kept within due bounds. And, since man as a member of the social order, retains what he possesses as individual, the same necessity which exists in the individual, must recur in a multitude of individuals, that is, in human society, in the social order. And hence arises the task of the State to pay due attention to this dual composition of human nature, that the correct equilibrium between the two constituents may be preserved. Hence the necessity of a Church as well, as of a State, a duality which corresponds to the dual nature of man. The more the State promotes the elevation of the spiritual nature, the more efficient the State becomes; for, an increase of virtue and a diminution of vice invariably raise the standard of morality, and that again is the work of religion. The most religious States present themselves, therefore,

to us as the most durable in point of time. This is in perfect harmony with reason, and is so amply verified by fact, that no room for doubt is left. In times gone by, the greater or less amount of success with which governments fulfilled this paramount duty to society, determined alike their prosperity and their longevity, and the same law holds good to-day. It will greatly facilitate our insight into the principles of modern governments, if we glance cursorily at the successive stages through which they passed before they became what they now are.

Two facts strike us with peculiar force when we take a retrospect of the condition of mankind in pre-Christian times. The one is that, through the whole complicated network of superstition that enveloped the Gentile world, there runs one legend like a silver thread; it appears and reappears in many different versions, yet fundamentally it is one: the tradition of man's creation, his fall and punishment, and the necessity of a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the outraged majesty of the Infinite. The other fact is, that the amount of knowledge originally possessed by the human race in regard to the primitive universal tradition became, as time advanced, obscured. The oldest religions are more Christian, so to speak, than those nearer to our era in point of time. The pre-Christian ages record a steady retrogression, instead of a continuous progress in that respect, and the greatest amount of moral and spiritual darkness prevailed at that very time when Christianity began to shed its light from heaven upon the utterly distorted and fragmentary notions of the original common legend, which were all that mankind had succeeded in preserving. Christianity confirmed not only the tradition of the creation and the fall of man, but it explained the first transgression in a clear and definite way, pointed out and described the indelible traces which it had left behind, namely, the disposition of the creature to revolt against the Creator; and Christianity did not stop there, it furnished also the means by which the tendency of man towards evil might be successfully overcome. The human race, rescued from barbarism by Christianity, has now passed in its onward march through nineteen centuries. Has this long period been one of uninterrupted progress? No, it has not. The paradoxical phenomenon that man is a religious creature, so much so that it is utterly impossible to entirely eradicate belief of some sort from his heart, be it merely the agnostic formula: *something is*; and that man, at the same time struggles incessantly to free himself from the chains which his belief creates for him,—this paradoxical phenomenon has found expression time and again during the Christian era in desperate conflicts. Yet all the events which may properly be comprised in that category up to the closing of mediæval history, may be designated as transitory rather than as lasting evidences of the perversity



of human nature. The first movement on a gigantic scale to set up the infinitesimal spark of human intelligence as a most worshipful deity, is the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century. At no time previous did there exist a more powerful and more favorable combination of conditions to give a revolt of man against his Maker a wide range within a short time. The fall of Constantinople, and, subsequent to it, the scattering of the accumulated literary treasures of Greece and Rome, disseminated the ideas and culture of Paganism; the discovery of a new continent roused the dormant energies of the maritime nations of Europe, and the invention of printing gave a fresh impetus to its intellectual life. The Reformation, in creating Protestantism, has theoretically affirmed religion and its necessity, but practically it has denied both. For it is impossible to assert that Protestantism did *not* establish the principle of private judgment, and the latter, dissolved into its essence, is the virtual dethronement of God and enthronement of human reason in His place. God ceases to be authority, when each individual's judgment becomes final authority, and a religion without God as authority for its decrees, scarcely deserves the name of religion. De Tocqueville remarks that the human mind, left to follow its own bent, will regulate the temporal and spiritual institutions of society upon one uniform basis, namely, man endeavors to harmonize the state in which he lives on earth with the state he believes awaits him after death? No religion has arisen since the Reformation which is not in juxtaposition to a political opinion, connected with it by affinity. For more than three hundred years Protestantism, because it is a system without any cohesive power, has split up into an endless multitude of sects, undisturbed, nay unconcerned, even, about the results to which it finally and legitimately leads. The French Revolution or '89 presents to us the first tangible consequence of the enthronement of the cultus of reason, alias private judgment. And in the saturation of the masses with revolutionary ideas lies, as we have pointed out before, the danger of the future.

The change produced by the Reformation in the tone and character of the social order, has been accompanied by corresponding changes in the governments. The mediæval monarchy disappeared. The sovereignty was transferred from the monarch to the nation, and the "sovereign (*supreme*) will of the people" was proclaimed as the original source of authority, *par excellence*. Almost every form of government now rests upon that principle; yet "the will of the nation" is one of those expressions which have been most extensively employed by the wily and the despotic, to render the principle itself barren, and under it to conceal absolutism. Nevertheless, the constitutional monarchies, as well as the republican governments of our times, rest alike on this basis.

There was a time since the Reformation during which the ruler of a country reigned himself and in his own pretended right, and we can point to no more emphatic illustration than the "*cujus regio, illius religio*" of that period. The process of disintegration was slow. By degrees the prerogatives of emperor and king were shorn of all vital elements, either by direct pressure or by way of compromise. The monarchical principle has receded before the democratic principle, and the masses have gradually secured a participation in the framing of laws and the decision of national questions. Again, the very essence of democratic governments rests in the principle of the absolute sovereignty of the majority. The moral power of the majority is founded upon the theory that the interests of the many are to be preferred to those of the few, and the legislatures of all existing governments are now swayed by the wishes of the majority. Thus ministries rise and fall through parliamentary majorities and minorities. Nor has the spirit of the age which thus finds expression in mere majorities, failed to impress its distinctive character upon the decrees which issue from the legislative assemblies. In almost all countries the contrast between the liberal and conservative parties has been decided in favor of the latter. A slight examination of the laws which have emanated from parliaments representing modern ideas, strongly tinged with atheism and antagonistic to all true religion, is sufficient to prove that the "*cultus of reason*" reigns supreme in the world to-day. The spirit of the age manifests its ascendancy in wholly emancipating the State from the Church. The measures taken for that purpose tend in their intrinsic nature not so much to effect a complete separation of Church and State, and to assign to each a definite sphere, as rather to make the Church subservient to the purposes of the State. In other words, the natural and legitimate order of things is reversed, and the temporal order declared to be above the spiritual order. Practically the emancipation of Church and State amounts to this: the first and paramount duty of every human being is not to the Creator, but to the State; man must be a citizen first; afterwards, as a being endowed with a soul, he may think, if he chooses, of his Maker.

Another *reform* which the spirit of the age saw fit to bestow upon society as a genuine benefit and a decided advance in the right direction, is the introduction of "*civil marriage*." We do not gainsay its perfect harmony with the subjugation of the spiritual to the temporal order, and we are ready to concede likewise its accordance with the idea, that the State must provide for the greatest happiness (after humanitarian fashion) of the greatest number. We do not wish to call in question that the conjugal relations between husband and wife are in very many instances far from happy, and from this standpoint the indissolubility of marriage seems, indeed, a de-

cided obstacle to the happiness of many a "citizen;" so, its abolition was decreed, and a door of relief opened in the easy possibility of divorce. Civil marriage is, in our opinion, a subject about which the less said the better. It inculcates impliedly the doctrine that the matrimonial state serves, after all, only for the gratification of the animal passions of human nature, and if deprived of the sanctity and of the inviolable character with which religion surrounds it, it sinks necessarily to an unchecked and unbridled satisfaction of the lowest of all passions, until the animalism of nature, exhausted, breaks down. The amazing rate at which business in divorce courts increases, the facility with which man and wife can sever their relations on account of incompatibility of temper, finally, the number of trials for polygamy before courts of law, are proofs how the "beneficial institution of civil marriage" is understood and interpreted. If civil marriage does not practically legalize concubinage, what, we may well ask, does it, or will it do? If civil marriage does not undermine the foundation of human society, the family, what will it do?

But the climax of how far the much-boasted enlightenment of the nineteenth century goes, is not yet reached. To reach it we must turn to the question of education. If a child grows up under the parental roof and acquires there the bigoted prejudices and the hateful superstition of his parents, instead of the great boon of independent free-thought, this child is less likely to become a modern "ideal citizen" than another child into whose bosom no erroneous superstitions about religion have ever been planted. It seemed, therefore, necessary in order to raise the intellectual standard of human society, to make education secular and compulsory. Religion as a branch of education in public schools has been simply left out, and that fact alone speaks volumes as to what importance the modern State attaches to religion. In several European countries a fierce battle is going on, with strong probabilities that the final decision will be in favor of the most *liberal* views. Religion is thereby virtually declared to be no longer a necessity for man.

What spectacle does Germany present in our day? Has the German Empire openly discarded religion? Oh, no! it is, on the contrary, a sincere advocate of religion, only it must not be the antiquated article, but *modern* religion. Many religious professions have been shaped under the influence of modern thought. On a close analysis they present hardly any claim to the name religion; for, with admirable liberality, they scatter broadcast the principles of atheism. Against these creeds the German Empire is not engaged in warfare. The German Chancellor is not guilty of having made the mistake of undertaking to suppress these, since they are powerful instrumentalities for promoting the purposes of the State.

But positive religion and its practice has been put under restrictions which amount to positive prohibition, and Catholicity is driven with relentless arm out of the German commonwealth. The Falk laws were hailed as the solution of a problem which had almost defied solution. And now what are these laws? What do they virtually promulgate? They embody and proclaim the deification of the State. The final arbiter between man and God is the Minister of Public Worship. Catholicity is openly declared an institution inimical to the State, opposed to all scientific progress, discouraging society from the free use of the intellect; an institution, therefore, for which there is no place in the ideal modern State. Whether the Minister of Public Worship is an inspired personage or not, has not been defined, it is true; but he is for all practical purposes an infallible oracle, and in order to be an exemplary citizen, and consequently, also, an exemplary modern Christian, it is only necessary to obey his injunctions. The German people must dismiss, henceforth, the absurd idea that what is right and wrong in the eyes of the Most High may not tally with what is declared right and wrong by the Ministry of Public Worship, guided and supported by the Falk laws. The wisdom of the Chancellor of Germany discovered only of late that the conception of the idea to devote one's life absolutely to charity is an aberration of the human intellect, and that it is, therefore, an obligation on the part of the government to prevent persons from giving way to such a frenzy. Hence it is that the Sister of Charity no longer dares devote her life to the alleviation of suffering within the precincts of the Empire. The noble Sisters whose gentle and tender hands nursed the sick and tenderly cared for the infirm and friendless, dare no longer perform those offices. They are no longer allowed to whisper words of comfort and consolation into the ears of the dying; to offer up their prayers for them and receive, perhaps with the last breath, the departing soul's last thank-offering.

It is in vain that we try to persuade ourselves that Germany is not in so forlorn a condition; for what we have said is borne out by facts. The authority of the State prescribes to man what he is to think and to believe and to do. The morality sanctioned by the State is the morality which it is the duty of human society to cultivate; the faith sanctioned by the State the only faith which individuals can adhere to with impunity. Life itself and all its cares and labors, all its joys and sufferings, are henceforth to be a free offering to the State. Man's destiny is to contribute his share to the purpose of the State by a complete resignation of his double nature. Man's greatest pride must be to be instrumental in perpetuating the State by his self-immolation, and man's greatest felicity must consist in the consciousness that thereby he procures,

not only for his own self, but also for his age and for posterity, the greatest attainable happiness for time, regardless of eternity. The State is at once father, and mother, and husband, and wife; and it extends in inimitable loving-kindness the benefit of a protective tutelage even over the child. The State relieves the citizen from the onerous burden of making out of the boy an honest, upright, industrious and pious man. The ruling principle in Germany is the deification of the State, and the German Chancellor employs and enforces it, unquestionably, with equal dexterity, firmness, and determination.

We turn now to France. The programme of the French Radicals, under M. Gambetta's leadership, is distinguished by genuine French candor. M. Gambetta has openly declared that he means "war against clericalism," and he has, moreover, for our benefit defined what he understands by "clericalism." It is not only the priest of the Church of Rome; it is belief in a supernatural order and its influence upon civil society. Faith in a Supreme Being and in a world to come, like a pestilence, must be exterminated. The sooner man is freed from that pernicious superstition the brighter the crown of glory to those who accomplish the result. The radicals succeeded in shortening the fast-expiring term of the soldier-president, whose honesty no one ever dared to question. M. Grévy succeeded MacMahon as President of the French Republic. It was a rapid change, and the world is pleased with it for two reasons. First, because it was effected without bloodshed, barricades, and revolution—not unfrequent companions of government experiments in France,—and again, because it promises a prolongation of the *status quo* for another seven years. What the result of the transition from conservative to radical views will be, it is impossible to predict. No nation is more volatile, more excitable, more easily led by the impulse of the moment, than the French nation. No nation, therefore, is more unfitted for a republican form of government, which demands decentralization of power, while in France a centralization of power will always be a necessity. M. Grévy, as President, was a surprise to France, to Europe, and to the world; and further new surprises may yet be in store in France before the last day of 1879 belongs to the past.

If we continue our tour of inspection, the Liberal parties, under whatever name they appear, in Italy, Austro-Hungary, Belgium, and Spain, breathe everywhere the same spirit. Their principles are similar to those we have described in France and Germany, though the measures enacted by them are tempered seemingly by a greater sense of justice towards the conservative elements. Emancipation of Church and State, civil marriage, and secular education, prove convincingly that the object of modern government is

to subject the spiritual order to the temporal power. The mission of the State is conceived to be the propagation of free-thought; and this is proclaimed in unmistakable language.

We are brought now face to face with the problem which we set out to solve, and are prepared to ask: If governments stifle in their subjects by every means at their command belief in a supernatural order; if they remove out of sight the aim which lies beyond the confines of this world; if they loosen the ideas of morality by dissolving and desecrating the sacred bond of marriage; if they engraft upon the multitude the belief that it is irrational to expect any but earthly happiness, does not the State itself virtually and practically teach the very principles from which the crying evils of the day have legitimately sprung? Does not the State by arbitrary measures and with persistent zeal train the people to the acceptance of the "creed of the nineteenth century?" And has the State, therefore, any right to turn round and arraign those whose crime consists in reasoning logically from a basis which the State furnished in the first instance, whose offence is to have drawn correct conclusions from premises which are, after all, only the enforced gift of the State?

If such conduct is not the height of inconsistency, then we must give up forming rational opinions. Yet, incredible as it would be, had we not incontestable evidence for it, State tribunals in our own times have the audacity to condemn and to punish people because they have advanced by a logical process of ratiocination one step further than the ruling classes have done. The forces still at the command of "the powers that be," may still, perhaps, be adequate to withstand a general uprising of the proletariat. But these forces diminish in proportion as the governmental provisions begin to bear fruit. The time when both will be equally matched and when the greater strength will pass over to the masses is certain to come; it is coming with giant strides. What will the contest be? It will be, authority without power arrayed against power without authority. This is simply what we must expect. It is in vain that the governments of our day try to fasten the responsibility of the impending calamity on other shoulders than their own; for the fault lies with them. Were the monstrous "isms" not already in existence, it could safely be predicted, and that with absolute certainty, that they would be generated ere long by the doctrines which are nurtured and fostered and spread by the modern State. Fanatics always did exist and always will exist, and fanatics always have had and always will have fanatical followers. It is not isolated individual fanatics, however, who cause the gravity of the present situation, but the formidable league of organized political associations, working under the dictation of the "Internationale."

Since existing governments are destitute of those elements which alone furnish a guarantee of stability, and since the modern State is incapacitated, by the very principles of its polity, from staying the advance of revolution, it is impossible for us to look forward with cheerfulness to the future. How can we, on the eve of a crisis, prognosticate simply a transitory disturbance, when every indication along the horizon betokens a terrible cyclone? The preponderance of the destructive over the reconstructive elements in the composition of the social order is so overwhelming that no rays of light seem to enter into the portents of the future. No decree, though it were enforced with the iron energy and indomitable determination which characterize the German Chancellor, no parliamentary measure, though it were passed without one voice dissenting, nothing, in short, which the modern State can devise, will be able either to check the advance or to exterminate the existence of the sinister forces, whose avowed object consists in overturning the existing order of things. The proper balance between the temporal and the spiritual authority has been disturbed, and daily it is being still more and more disturbed by the modern State. It is the aim and the boast of the nineteenth century to eliminate religion from society; and now the work, though incomplete and imperfect, already makes the governments tremble. When infuriated mobs of countless numbers shall meet authorities impotent to offer any resistance, these latter will succumb only to arms, which they themselves forced into the hands of their assailants; they will be beaten with weapons of their own manufacture, and by men of their own forming and training. The spirit of the age has proved powerful to destroy, but now proves powerless to rebuild. The State could dethrone religion, but the State cannot enthrone it again. The proper relations between body and soul, between the temporal and the spiritual order, must be re-established, and to each must be assigned again its right place in the individual, in society, and in the State. The State, as we have seen, is unable in its present condition to perform this office.

The only remedy for this state of things, the power which alone can avert the impending catastrophe, is religion. Religion alone can preserve and reconstruct the social order on a basis which will be durable, and contain at the same time in its very essence the elements of prosperity and stability. Man must be restored again to faith; he must be taught to look forward beyond this life, instead of fixing his gaze stolidly on the ground; he must be made again to know that all inequalities of this world will be redressed in the next; he must live again for that realm where there is neither suffering nor death; he must understand again that authority derives its title from God, and ascends in a sublime hierarchy from the father

to the king, from the king to the pontiff, from the pontiff to Him, who is both our Creator and Redeemer, our Judge and our Benefactor. The family must again become the nucleus of happiness, and marriage a holy union, on the altar of which man offers up a threefold sacrifice in his threefold capacity—one to God, by a life of purity and love, one to the human family, by propagating the race, one to the State, by educating his offspring into citizens upon which he and the State may look with honorable pride. It is entirely useless to expect a cure of the present social pestilence from any other source than that which it has pleased Divine Providence, through the advent of our Saviour, to institute for that purpose, namely, the Church.

How erroneous it is to regard the Catholic religion as the natural enemy of progress and civilization, and hence of modern governments, whereas, in truth, it is the one religion of all that is most favorable to an equality of condition, is admirably told by De Tocqueville. He says:

“On doctrinal points the Catholic faith places all human capacities upon the same level; it subjects the wise and the ignorant, the man of genius and the vulgar crowd, to the details of the same creed; it imposes the same observances upon the rich and the needy; it inflicts the same austerities upon the strong and the weak; it listens to no compromise with mortal man, but subjecting all the human race to the same standard, it confounds all distinctions of society at the foot of the same altar, even as they are confounded in the sight of God.”

We have said that it is the mission of the Catholic Church to hasten to the succor of man and of society in his and its greatest stress. And already the voice of the successor of Him, who brought the light of Christianity down from heaven, has sounded. In the Encyclical of December, 1878, Pope Leo XIII., after dwelling upon the grave outlook, and then vividly depicting the dangers that encompass human society, in a spirit of charity, and yet of dignified, undaunted courage, points out the road which prince and statesman, nation and family, the aggregated people and the individual must alike pursue, if they desire to avoid total shipwreck.

Whether the political outlook will remain dark and cheerless, as at present, or become brighter, as is to be hoped, will depend, therefore, upon whether existing governments will, or will not, heed the voice which has spoken to them. If they continue to display that arrogance and indifference which is the temper of the modern mind, whether in states or individuals, towards the utterances of the Sovereign Pontiff; if they turn away from that power which, in their folly and frenzy, they have tried to crush, but failed, as fail they ever must in like attempts, for it is a power divine and invulnerable, possessed of a life which is inextinguishable because eternal; if they persist in their wicked, impious folly, then the



most calamitous social eruption the world has yet beheld seems certain to overwhelm Europe. But if the governments and peoples of Europe will listen to and return to her who, though calumniated and persecuted, in superhuman charity extends her helping hand to her persecutors in distress, then we may expect relief. Reason and history, both tell us that in the Church alone dwells the power to restore the equilibrium in the dual nature of individual man, which the presence of sin has destroyed; and so, too, by necessary consequence, in human society and in the State. For, nineteen hundred years ago voices of angels gave warning to all times to come that "Glory to God in the Highest" is a necessary condition, precedent and concomitant, to "peace on earth."

---

### CATHOLIC SOCIETIES.

**B**Y Catholic Societies we mean those bodies of Catholics who are united together for some purpose more or less relating to religion or morality, and under the guidance and approval of the Church, an approval ordinarily signified by the presence of their chaplain. Not every association of Catholics, therefore, is a Catholic society, otherwise any banking company, composed exclusively of Catholic business men, should be called a Catholic society or association. We are aware that this is sometimes done; but with bad taste, and with more or less harm to religion, often made responsible in this way for the shortcomings of individuals. We remember once reading some sharp remarks of the *New York Herald*, venting its spleen against some one by styling him "*a professional Catholic*." It was wickedly witty. But our enemies sometimes shoot these remarks at us, not without a certain spice of truth in them. And it is to be hoped that the abuse of the word Catholic, for business or other purposes not religious, will be confined to the narrowest limits compatible with human frailty. In his late Encyclical our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., recognizing the existence of societies as a special feature of this age, and deploring the evil influences under which societies generally are, which with truthful appreciation he points out, recommends as an antidote for the children of the Church, the formation of other

similar societies among laymen under the guidance of religion. His words are: "It seems fitting that societies of artisans and workmen be encouraged, which, placed under the guardianship of religion, may make their members content with their lot, patient under their burdens, and lead them to live a quiet and tranquil life."

The question, therefore, is not whether we should have societies, a question already practically settled, and now officially settled by the sovereign Pontiff; but how are our societies to be constituted; how are they to be organized; what are the dangers they are to guard against; how are they to stand in relation to the Church; how far is the Church to wield her influence over them; how far are they to be allowed to take their part in solving the labor questions of the day;—all these are very important questions, which we shall strive to answer after we shall first have treated of Societies in general, and the relation of the Church to them in the past.

The spirit of association is in man in virtue of his very nature. Once the inhabitants of the earth became numerous, and the ties of the one family became loosened, common interest formed men into nations, and varied interests common to a number had the effect of making this number cling together, and constitute a body united together by common customs. The remains of antiquity that have come down to us tell us of the existence of colleges of those whose pursuits were similar; the well-known college of bakers of ancient Rome, for example, and the guilds of the Middle Ages are only another confirmation of this tendency of human nature. The Church, whose office is not to pervert human nature but to foster it, with her characteristic prudence took these associations under her protection and guided them in the right path, except where her influence was set at naught by the passions of men. She was herself one vast society, and the experience she had gained by centuries of experience was placed at their disposal. Even at the early period of her struggles she had within her these colleges, and in the catacombs are to be seen the representation of the *fossores*, or guardians of her cemeteries, allusions to coopers and to other tradesmen. Acting under the guidance of the Spirit dwelling in her she formed the most perfect of colleges—the Religious Order, realizing what the Tusculan philosopher had written: *Omnium societatum nulla præstantior est, nulla firmior, quam cum viri boni moribus similes sunt familiaritate conjuncti.* Off., lib. I.

We see, therefore, the Church, given by God to govern and direct the moral order of society, taking the association of laymen under her ægis, laying down for them laws, endowing them with privileges and giving them a canonical status, which made them

respectable; securing also for them a legal entity, she conferred importance on them, giving them a legal power which checked the daring of the feudal lord who chanced to be a tyrant.

But if they were made what they became by the power and widespread influence of the Church, she did not give them full sway to do as they listed. On the contrary she curbed them by salutary restraints. From time to time it would happen that they forgot themselves, and asserted their independence of their local ecclesiastical superior. Then would come the appeal to the central authority of the Church, and the decision reasserting the power of the bishop. There are some of these decisions on record, which as interesting exemplifications of what we have said we introduce here.

It must be remarked that these societies came to be known as Confraternities, and were instituted for all kinds of purposes, all more or less connected with religious exercises. Thus there existed at Lanciano, in Italy, a society or Confraternity, known as the society for taking care of the dead. These good people came into conflict with their archbishop, and the case went to Rome. They didn't want him to have anything to do with the election of their officers, and much less did they desire him to look into their accounts; and if he did, they wanted the work done through men of their own choosing. The Sacred Congregation of the Council, on the 20th of September, 1710, decreed, after mature deliberation: 1st, that they must proceed with their election in the presence of the vicar-general, as commanded by the archbishop; 2dly, that an election made otherwise was invalid; 3dly, that the election of the officers required for its validity the confirmation of the archbishop; 4thly, that the society must give an account of its funds and expenses to the archbishop; 5thly, that the archbishop could make use of his own agents, and was not bound to make use of those chosen by the members.

There was another society at Offida, near Ascoli, in Italy. They were also a body of men who, in like manner as the above, had as their special object to pray for the dead. They had their legal and canonical status. They differed with their bishop, and the case went to Rome. Like those just spoken of they tried to keep the bishop from having anything to do with their elections, and from auditing their accounts. The same Sacred Congregation of the Council, on the 3d and 24th of March, 1725, decreed, in answer, that the bishop, personally or by deputy, could be present at the elections; that he could remove the officers who were unfit for their place; and that the society was bound to give an account of their pecuniary administration to the bishop. It is of no use to

multiply instances. These are enough to show the spirit of the Church, and her mode of dealing with such societies.

The societies we have nowadays are of two kinds; one is the Confraternity as described above; the other is the society which has no recognized legal or canonical status, but which consists of laymen united together under the patronage of the Church for some beneficial purpose. They are societies for mutual aid; and that aid, according to the scope to which it tends, generally gives the name to the organization.

It is of these latter societies that we shall now specially speak, as they are those which have arisen from the circumstances of our time, the outcome of the vicissitudes of the nineteenth century.

It may prove a useful guide to us at the outset to remember that these Catholic Societies have been rendered necessary by the secret societies that have overspread the nations of the earth. They have been constituted as it were in self defence. The manner, therefore, in which secret societies have been constituted will to some extent give us a clue as to the constitution of our Catholic societies.

It is no secret that the so-called secret societies here in America are in great part merely beneficial associations, for mutual aid in sickness or distress, and especially for the advancement of business relations. That some of them, if not all, have affiliations with the secret societies of Europe, societies political and rationalistic, as well as beneficial, is a fact known to us; for we have had it from the mouth of those who, not understanding the languages of the countries through which they were journeying in Europe, found, in spite of that, the sign-manual a passport, and a command obeyed with alacrity. Their principal feature, however, here, besides their secrecy and strange forms, or rituals, is the business and beneficial feature.

From these societies, Catholics are necessarily excluded by the circumstances of the case. The oath of secrecy, and the false principles which are the basis of these societies, sapping the foundation of religion and government, have long since, as we all know, made the sovereign authority of the Church condemn them formally. The exclusion in this way of Catholics makes them look around in self-defence for means of protection. The movement is general, and we should regard it with favor. Our Catholics should band together, come to each other's assistance, and give that mutual aid and comfort and even business help, denied them by the other social combinations of the day; for it is an undeniable fact that unless a man belong to some secret trades-union, he will hardly be able to find employment. We are the last person to wish to array our fellow-Catholics against our non-Catholic fellow-countrymen, to whom we acknowledge ourselves sincerely attached. But

when we behold them acting as they do, and treating worthy men and faithful citizens with disregard, and neglect, and ostracism, because they are conscientious, then we say the time has come not to array ourselves in a hostile manner against our countrymen, but to band ourselves together in self-defence; then we say the time has come for us to stretch out our hands to each other, to employ each other, to favor each other, to form societies for mutual aid, and for mutual benefit in sickness or distress, and to further each other's business relations, to secure insurance of property or life, in a word to form the counterpart of the associations from which the laws of the Church exclude us, but without their objectionable features, and in a spirit of charity which will contrast to advantage with the spirit that animates them, and therefore not to the exclusion from employment of non-Catholics, who of course are not members of our societies.

Our societies thus constituted as to their general form are to be organized on the basis of religion. The Church which is given us by God to guide us, which is God working in the midst of mankind, is our only sure corner-stone, and anything standing without her is sure to fall. We want our societies to last, to prosper, and to do a real good work. The only thing then to be done is to make God's Church, first and last, the foundation and the binding power of our fabric. The way to do this is to take as our standard the decisions and openly declared principles of the Church, to make respect for her authority paramount, to resolve that a word from her will make us give up any cherished plan; and all this must be from the deepseated conviction of our faith, looking on all authority, and especially the authority of the Church, as of God. Here, again, the principles that are the basis of the secret societies in general will serve as an indication to us, telling us what principles held and taught by the Church are to be those especially held as guides for our Catholic societies. We find these societies standing on a selfish principle. They seek themselves at the expense of society, for they disregard the essential safeguard of society, authority, when they deem their interests require it. The history of these associations, if not here, certainly in Europe, is one of plotting against government, of thwarting of justice, of violation of trust, of violence, bloodshed, and even secret assassination. How far anything of this kind takes place here we will not go on to say. We know that the excesses of Europe have not, thus far, been imitated here; but that there is imitation to some extent of the blamable features of European secret societies in this country, is true. We shall only mention one fact to show we are not speaking wildly. A friend of ours was passing the night with a family that had given him hospitality in his journeying. The members of the family were

all together talking with our friend, in saddened tones, of one of their number, who had led a bad life and, as a result, had killed a man, and was to suffer the penalty of the law by hanging on the following day. While they were yet talking, there was a rap at the door. It was opened, and who should walk in but the condemned man himself. For a moment all were breathless; but when a near relative found words to ask him, how it was he escaped from prison, his answer was: "Had I not been a Freemason, it would have been all up with me."

It is unlawful to thwart justice; and therefore such an act as the above could not be tolerated one moment among conscientious Catholics, and could not be the act of a Catholic Society, whose blazon must be *respect for authority*. In fact, this spirit of obedience and respect, and, what is more, love for authority, is a special characteristic of the True Religion. For God is the Author of all things, and the Author of all authority. He Himself is Authority itself, and any created authority is but a participation of that authority which is essentially in Him. In the same way we owe to that primal essential authority, God Himself, obedience, respect, and love, so do we owe to the created participation of it a proportionate degree of obedience, respect, and love. This is the reason why the Catholic should set himself against that spirit born of Protestantism, private judgment and self-assertion, which leads men to condemn authority, to look on it with jealousy as an enemy, and to cherish unkindly feelings towards those that exercise it, even though they exercise it justly. Catholics, on the contrary, must follow the advice of the Apostle, obey cheerfully, and from conscience, that those ruling them may discharge their onerous duties in joy, and not in sorrow.

Another dangerous principle against which Catholic Societies must guard, and with regard to which they will find the Church guiding them in the right way, is the levelling tendency of the day. If any one will take up the preamble of some of the trade-unions, he will find therein more or less of socialistic theory—the arraying of the working classes against the moneyed class; and it may be that he will find the condition that when a member becomes an employer, he must cease to be a member. He becomes one of the hostile class. Certainly this state of things is not Christian. We are not going to censure unduly the working class; we feel more disposed in our heart to censure the wealthy class, whose grasping at wealth has brought about this uprising against them. But undeniably both classes are wrong. Each has ignored the other; each disregards the rights of the other. As the Sovereign Pontiff, in the Encyclical, *Quod apostolici muneris*, beautifully and learnedly writes: "Catholic wisdom, taking its stand on the precepts

of natural and divine law, has with great forethought provided for public and domestic tranquillity by means of what she believes and teaches with regard to the right of dominion, or of property, and the division of those possessions which have been gotten together for the wants and uses of life. For, while socialists traduce the right of property as an invention of man, repugnant to natural equality; and, affecting a community of goods, think that poverty is not to be borne with equanimity, but that the possessions and rights of the wealthy can be violated with impunity; the Church with more propriety and utility recognizes among men, differing naturally in the strength of their body and intellect, inequality also in the possession of property; and requires that the right of property and dominion, which is from nature itself, be for every one sacred from the hands of others and inviolate."

How true is this! One man is born almost an idiot, another with talent; will the career of these two be the same, their success the same? One man has health, the other is a cripple; will these two be equal in the results of their physical labor? One man has given him the advantages of education, and culture, and experience; the other's lot is ignorance and neglect; will their social position and influence be the same? The socialists themselves know it is their men of education that lead them; they follow.

There is no such thing as universal equality. It is a figment of the wild brain of the agitator, coquetting with the ignorance of the mass of mankind! We are equal in this, that God loves us all, wishes us all to be saved, and will judge us all according to our works, without respect of persons. We are said to be equal before the laws of our country. Beyond this, there is and can be no equality, unless you change nature, which even the Socialists will not pretend they have the power of doing.

The first duty, therefore, of a Catholic Society, after recognizing the right of God to our obedience, is to recognize the rights of one's neighbor, the right of property, the right to liberty undisturbed by interference of others, the right to social position, the right to influence and reputation honestly gained by talent, industry, and good conduct, the right of each one to lead a life of tranquillity and happiness; in a word, the rule of charity which does unto others as we should wish them to do unto us—this is to be the principle of action among Catholic Societies. We are to respect inviolably the rights of others as we look to having our own respected. If the Catholics who compose these Societies of ours will take care to follow the decisions and teaching of their Church, they will have an unerring rule, by which to discharge this great and imperative duty; while by doing so they will show themselves to be the salt of the earth.

How are Catholic Societies to stand in relation to the Church, is a point which may receive a different answer, according to the way in which one understands the question. We simply say, first, that every one in the Church is subject to the higher powers in it, in all that relates to spiritual matters; secondly, that in what is temporal, it would seem advisable that the liberty of administering their own affairs should be interfered with as little as possible by Church authority. But they should always cherish a loyal and submissive spirit towards the Church, God's Representative on earth. How far the Church should wield her influence over them is a delicate question. But when we consider that she is given us from above as the guide to truth, there can be no other opinion but that, as the influence of the Church should penetrate our whole life and influence every action of ours, in accordance with the great expression of St. Paul, "The just man liveth by faith;" so this influence should be felt in the same manner in every Catholic body of men. This influence should be represented in them by their chaplain, who, if for no other reason, should be there to keep the members from being indoctrinated with the false notions of to-day, so easily taken up from the newspapers, even so-called Catholic newspapers, from the workshop, and from the example and principles of men of like avocations, banded together in secret organization. We consider this of the very first importance; for it cannot be denied that not a few Catholics of the lower walks of life have imbibed socialistic principles to a greater or less extent. They have forgotten their Catechism, and are learning the catechism of the secret societies.

There remains one point more to be dwelt on,—how far any Catholic Society can be permitted to take part in meeting the labor questions of the day. The matter is a very extensive one, and we do not pretend to exhaust it in a few words. Still, certain principles can be laid down that are very important. The labor question, as understood by those who generally speak of it, is the question not of finding work, for the demand regulates the supply, but the struggle between employers and employed. It is carried on by the trades-unions on the one side and capitalists on the other. The action of the union is ordinarily despotic. They settle the question of strikes, and how much is to be asked as wages. If capitalists always gave fair wages, we may confidently say there would be no need of such associations with such an aim. But it is notorious that greed of wealth does not often allow capitalists to be generous or even just. Hence the poor hardworking man seeks support in combinations and in his numbers. The order given must be carried out; the strike is ordered, and woe to the man who will not take part in it. What is worse, if any one presumes to work in



spite of the prohibition, he is made to understand that he must desist on pain of risk to life or limb, and the threat is very often carried out.

We suppose the existence of a Catholic trades-union, for our ordinary Societies have nothing to do with this question; their scope lies in a different direction. Obviously, a Catholic Society could not countenance active interference with the rights of others; it could not take the law into its own hands; it could not foster sedition, destruction of property, violence and bloodshed. There is one right, however, the members have, and which they could not be denied the use of. As they can hire out their labor, so if they do not think the remuneration sufficient, they can refuse to work singly, or in a body. They can use all lawful means to gain their point; but they cannot go further. But even this exercise of right might be in abeyance, owing to the danger of civil discord that might arise; and it should, therefore, be used with moderation. We apprehend that among Catholics, who are not so only in name, such a state of tension would be next to impossible; for charity on the part of the employer, and reason on the part of the workman, would settle the matter at once, or prevent its coming up. Still, the conflict is possible, and the men have their right to labor or not as they wish; but, as we have said, no right beyond what the law of God, and the law of the land when not in contradiction with God's law, allow them. They could, therefore, to that extent, and to that extent alone, sympathize with their fellow-workmen and take part in the solution of the question of just remuneration. They would, however, even in this, encounter stumbling-blocks, for they would find that many of the labor associations are led on by men whose principles are Socialistic, and they would for this reason find that many propositions are broached and measures initiated which would not observe the just and natural relations of labor and capital. In reality the laborer has no right to a cent more than he has contracted for. He is at liberty not to enter into the contract; once he has done so he must keep his word.

We do not refer to instances of grinding exaction on the part of employers taking advantage of the poverty of their employees. But we speak of those who aspire to get possession of their employer's goods, to have a community of goods. They form their own ideas of how much they ought to have of the profits, and take advantage of their employer's straits to force him to terms. This is what checks industry, and contributes to people the country with tramps. Ordinarily speaking, the daily support of the man himself and of his wife and children, ought to be the least remuneration a good workman should receive; what his wife could

make should go to provide for the future. Skilled labor should, of course, receive proportionately more. Once workmen receive this amount they have no just reason to complain. They should stifle envy, and, to use the words of Pope Leo XIII., learn to live contented with the lot God has given them. What will certainly make the Catholic workman so live is the truth so beautifully announced by the Apostles: we have no permanent citizenship here, but we look for another. We are not here forever; we are journeying to our real country and home, the hereafter; and our status or condition there depends not on worldly wealth or influence, but upon our works done here; so that it is in every man's power to secure for himself a high position and a great degree of glory in his true home. If any man will keep this well before his eyes he will find it a powerful help to make him content with the station of life Providence has allotted him.

We close these few remarks with an observation regarding the importance of our Catholic Societies looking to the Church more than ever for guidance. There never was a period when wilder theories were broached, more extensively circulated, or more read by the people. In our own midst we have hosts of Europeans, many of them clever and well-educated, who were forced to leave their respective countries because of their efforts to overthrow social order. These men have become editors of newspapers, and have been feeding our simpler American population with what they call their advanced ideas, till we hardly recognize the land of our youth. These false ideas in religion and in the social order the Church examined thoroughly where they first arose. She has condemned them, and her condemnation has been met with an acknowledgment that she has spoken truly, but at the same time with a cry of defiance. Let us, therefore, stand to this Church, which has the Spirit of Wisdom from above; let us have as our compass the Syllabus of the great Pius IX.; let us reverently receive and emblazon on our banner the late Encyclical of the learned Leo XIII.

---

## THE RELATION OF THE POPES TO LITERATURE, PRIOR TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

NO one can deny that the Popes have always been the patrons of theology. It is a science which particularly becomes their state and office as priests and spiritual guides. Consequently there has been little or no attack made on their reputation as advocates of theological science. Nor in view of their countless productions of a theological character, running from the Epistles of St. Peter, the first Pope, down to our own times, through letters of Leo the Great, Homilies of Gregory I., theological works like that of Benedict XIV. on "Diocesan Synods," and the whole array of Bulls, Briefs, and Encyclicals, treating of every dogmatical, moral, ascetical, mystical, canonical, and rubrical subject that has ever been discussed within the last nineteen centuries, and filling scores of ponderous tomes, large and numerous enough to crowd the shelves of spacious libraries, can any one reasonably assert that the Popes have not been the Mæcenases of theological studies. But have they been, at the same time, the patrons of literature? This is a question upon which there has been much discussion. A certain class of writers, not content with blaming them as having been adverse to the progress of the natural sciences, for having imprisoned mathematicians, and subjected astronomers like Galileo to the pains and penalties of the Inquisition, accuse them of general obscurantism, of impeding the progress of art, and of being like so many drags on the chariot-wheels of human intellectual development. According to these writers the Popes have been opposed to poetry, to the drama, to painting, to sculpture, and to music. They have abhorred universal education and detested inventions, especially that of printing, for the reason that they wished to keep the people in ignorance. According to these gentlemen, ignorance and popery are correlative terms. They point to the dark ages for proofs of their theory, especially to those centuries in which, owing to the misfortunes of the times and to lay intrusion in clerical affairs, a few Pontiffs, more like unto Judas than to Peter, disgraced the tiara, while they proved the divinity of the Church by illustrating the fact that she can live in spite of the vices of her rulers or of her children. These scandals of sin and ignorance are taken as proofs that the Popes were unfriendly to literature and to the arts; these spots on the sun are assumed to show that the whole orb is an opaque body.

Now, it is not our purpose, in this article, to refute in detail all

the objections of such enemies of the Papacy; nor do we intend to give all the proofs which might be adduced to show how erroneous is their opinion. We do not mean to go over ground in a special manner, which has been already trodden by the champions of the Popes, to show that they were the friends of the mathematicians as well as of the *littérateurs*; and that the story of Galileo's punishment has been distorted into a calumny against the Roman Church. All these subjects have been exhausted by men like De Maistre, Donoso Cortes, Montalembert, Lacordaire, Auguste Nicolas, Dr. Brownson—a name never to be forgotten by American Catholics—by Cardinal Wiseman, and others, who have left nothing for their successors to investigate or to establish. We wish to restrict ourselves to a special inquiry into what the Popes have done particularly for that branch of the fine arts comprised under the head of Literature or Belles-Lettres, in the ages preceding the eleventh century. The reason for this proceeding is, that the most difficult part of the theme may be made the most manifest. The cathedrals of Europe, with their exquisitely beautiful stained glass windows, built while the Popes enjoyed full sway over the European conscience; the masterpieces of painting and sculpture handed down to us by those favorites of the Popes, Raphael, Michael Angelo, Fra Angelico, Guido Reni, Bernini, and others; easily convince the impartial student that the Popes have been patrons of those arts and of architecture. History tells us that a Pope, Gregory the Great, is the father of plain music in all its forms. He reformed the Ambrosian Chant, which had been used in the Church up to the sixth century. Nor can it be said that the Popes are unfriendly to the full development of the art of music, because of their opposition to the introduction of operatic airs into the choir-singing of the mass. This objection would hold good only in case the reprobation of an abuse, or the preference for a certain mode, of art could be fairly construed into a condemnation of all its modes. No Pope ever condemned operatic music in its own place, nor has any Pope ever condemned the proper *use* of what is called modern music in the Church. The Popes have reprobated abuses of the art of music as they would reprove the nude in statuary or paintings intended for the Church. It is a mistake to infer from the expressed preference of a Pontiff for plain chant, that he necessarily condemns the masses of Mozart or of Haydn. He simply reprove the music of certain church choirs for being as indecent in the sacred edifice as would be the Venus of Milo or the Apollo of Belvidere in the niches around the altar. The Ambrosian Chant and the gay measures in use before Gregory the Great's time were permitted by Pontiffs as holy and learned as himself, and it would be illogical to conclude that he intended to condemn them absolutely, since some of them were mar-

tyrs for the faith, when he reformed the sacred song. Palestrina's reform of music, at the time of the Council of Trent, was also needed; but the papal sanction given to his "*Mass of Pope Marcellus*," did not necessarily exclude further progress in the study of harmony or counterpoint. In disputed cases of this kind, namely, as to the proper kind of music to be used, there is generally some fanaticism on both sides of the question. Those who indiscriminately condemn plain chant, are not more in error than they who would restrict our gorgeous liturgy, which like Joseph's coat is of many colors, to the slavery of any undeveloped and imperfect art. We admit into the Church paintings of the Madonna, from various schools, for there is no papal exclusiveness as to the color or form which must serve as the artist's ideal. The various styles of architecture are equal before the Papal See. The fact that there is but one Gothic church in Rome, and that a modern one, argues nothing against the Gothic style of architecture; nor, consequently, does the Roman preference for plain chant in the ordinary services of the Church prove aught against figured music, properly adapted to the divine service, and properly sung at it. The general custom of having musical vespers in the city of Rome at the great feasts, the Palestrina music of the Papal choir, and the beautiful *Misereres* sung in the Sistine Chapel during Holy Week, sufficiently prove the truth of this statement. When making a charge of this kind, it is always beneficial to recollect what Horace says: "In vitium ducit culpæ fuga." (*Ars Poetica*, v. 31.)

Even the modern drama owes its origin to the Church. Who does not know that during the Middle Ages, when Papal influence was supreme, the "Mystery" plays were often performed in the church or the churchyard, the clergy taking the principal parts. The "*Moralities*," as another species of mediæval dramatic composition was called, were also of religious origin. It was only when these plays degenerated and became blasphemous that the Church authorities condemned them. The oft-recurring drama performed under Church sanction at Oberammergau, is a reminder of the Church plays of the past, and the fact that even the ecclesiastical colleges in Rome allow their students, during Carnival time, to take part in dramatic performances, proves that the Church sanctions the drama, when it does not degrade itself by immorality or infidelity. The Church prohibitions of theatres, and condemnation of actors and actresses, at certain times, were not universal, but either local or in consequence of abuses which had crept into and defiled the temples of the Muses. The Pontificate never put its ban upon the Muses, unless they laid aside the robes of decency. St. John's Gospel is a beautiful drama, full of dialogue and sparkling with wit. St. Peter's Epistles show

that the first Pontifical Fisherman had a poetic soul, and poetic tastes which have been imitated by many of his successors, down to the present poet-pontiff, Leo XIII.

It would be hard to find, even without their divine inspiration, two more eloquent discourses than St. Peter's two Epistles. They are more earnest than Cicero's attacks on Catiline, or Demosthenes' invectives against Philip; and superior to the best productions of these great pleaders in force of argument and clearness of statement. After reading them, it would be difficult not to obey the holy Fisherman, when, in language prompted by what he had often seen when he watched by the sea of Galilee to draw his nets at break of day, he says: "*Attend as to a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the daystar arise in your hearts.*" (II. Ep., chap. i. v. 19.)

At the very threshold of our investigation into the literary taste of the Papacy, we are met with an objection taken from a text in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter xix. v. 16, in which we read that the Christian converts "brought together *their books* and burnt them before all: and counting the price of them, they found the money to be fifty thousand pieces of silver." From this passage it is argued that the early Christians, and consequently the Popes, were hostile to literature, and that they burned all the books which were not of service to religion. But the context proves that this inference is illogical; for there is question only of books of astrology or magic: "*Ἰκανοὶ δὲ τῶν τα περὶ ἐργα πραξάντων*;" besides, allusion is made to some of the Ephesians alone, and not to the conduct of all the Christians. We have a manifest proof that whatever the Ephesians may have done, they had not the sanction of St. Paul, who, speaking to the Athenians, quotes frequently from the Greek poets, as St. Jerome demonstrates in his seventieth epistle. Moreover, the Christian writers of the first ages show a full knowledge of the opinions and of the works of the pagan authors; and, in fact, we get full information regarding many points of ancient philosophy from the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and other Christians. This shows that there was no prohibition against reading or studying the pagan classics. It is true that we have a Canon of an early Council (iv. Council of Carthage, chapter xvi.), forbidding bishops to read the works of pagan authors; but this is a prohibition made for the bishops of those times only, whose principal care should be to attend to the wants of their flocks, which they had been neglecting. In this sense we are also to understand St. Jerome's complaint in his twenty-first epistle: "That there are some priests who, throwing aside the Gospels and the Prophets, read comedies, sing love songs, and contin-

ually peruse Virgil." But it is evident that he is only reprehending an abuse, for he himself, rigid though he was, names various profane authors whom he used to read. In his introduction to the Prophet Daniel, he tells us by way of apology, that if he occasionally alludes to the classical authors, it is for the purpose of showing that the things predicted by the Prophets "may be found in the works of the Greeks and the Latins, and in the writings of other peoples."

Of course the severity of the persecutions would naturally prevent the early Christians from being learned, since education, to be complete, needs leisure, wealth and encouragement. In spite, however, of numerous difficulties, many of the Roman Christians especially were proficient in literature. For instance, the Martyr St. Cassian, of Imola, in Italy, kept a public school. Prudentius, in his ninth hymn, "*Peti Stephanon*," tells us that while Cassian was teaching, a persecution arose, during which he was accused of being a Christian :

*"Præfuerat studiis puerilibus et grege multo  
Septus magister litterarum sederat.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Ecce Fidem quatiens tempestas sæva premebat  
Plebem dictatam Christianæ gloriæ."*

The poet then describes how the teacher was killed by his idolatrous pupils, who stabbed him with their *styli*, used for writing. The best authorities, among others the Bollandists, inform us that this took place, at the latest, during the reign of Diocletian. Prudentius, who was born A.D. 348, speaks of the fact as of an ancient occurrence. It proves, therefore, that the laws of the Roman Church were not adverse to the cultivation of letters in the first centuries. The reader will recollect that we are writing only of what occurred in the neighborhood of the Roman Pontiffs, and need not extend our investigations to the schools of Greece or of Africa, in which Christian philosophers flourished before Justin, and Catholic rhetoricians taught before Augustine. There were Christian public schools of philosophy in Alexandria, as every one knows, before the conversion of Constantine, and Pantænus, Ammonius, Clement, and Origen rendered them famous. Nor is it true that those who had taught eloquence or poetry while pagans, were obliged to give up their profession on becoming Christians. Lactantius, after his conversion, taught rhetoric in Nicomedia; and Minutius Felix, although a Christian, pleaded cases in the Roman Forum. He could not have done this without Papal sanction. These writers are of the third century. Minutius, in his dialogue called "*Octavius*," beautifully and learnedly defends Christianity, and ridicules the superstitions of Paganism. Yet, in the exordium

of that work he clearly states that he went out of Rome to take a vacation from his forensic labors; thus showing that even under Paganism, a man might be a learned lawyer and practice his profession, while he remained a good Christian. The persecution, it should be understood, did not strike all the prominent Christians, nor did it destroy all the Christian churches.

It is probable that many of the learned in Rome and elsewhere followed the example of Minutius in the West, and continued the practice of their profession, as many in the East followed the example of St. Justin the Martyr, who wore his philosopher's cloak, and taught philosophy, even after his conversion. Thus, in the reign of Commodus, there was a Christian Senator named Apollonius, who was permitted to write a defence of his faith, and read it publicly in the Senate.<sup>1</sup> He was, nevertheless, beheaded. The historian Eusebius narrates the same fact; and further adds that he was learned in letters and in philosophy.<sup>2</sup> Such a prominent man must have been intimate with the reigning Popes, and must have had their blessing in his labors. Nor was the learned profession or medicine wanting in its Christian converts, who imitated the physician, St. Luke, the Evangelist. The learned Dominican Mamachi, in his great work on Christian Antiquities, gives us the names of several Christian physicians recorded on ancient tablets pertaining to the first two centuries of our era. These facts suffice to show that Papal influence was not adverse to the cultivation of letters in the first ages.

The truth is that the Popes encouraged learning then as now. The names and numbers of those Latins who, although Christians, were renowned not only for their sacred, but for their profane knowledge also, in the first centuries, show this plainly.

Cave, a learned Protestant writer, and Ceillier, a distinguished historian, give abundance of instances of ecclesiastical writers of prominence in the early ages; but our limits prevent us from doing more than referring the reader to them. Now, it is legitimate to infer that men who manifested excellence of style in dealing with sacred subjects, must have occasionally shown a similar excellence in dealing with other topics when occasion required them to be treated. The pen that could write a beautiful homily did not forget its cunning when it wrote on music or some other fine art. Among the first Popes St. Clement is remarkable for a letter to the Corinthians; and a second letter to them, as well as the "Apostolical Constitutions," is attributed to him. Common fame evidently considered him a writer of no ordinary ability. We have

<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome de Viris Illustribus, c. xlii.

<sup>2</sup> Hist. Eccl. l. ccxxi.



a letter attributed to Pope St. Cornelius, and fragments attributed to St. Stephen.

I. St. Soter, made Pope A.D. 168, wrote a work against the Montanists. Sigebert, an author of the twelfth century, tells us that St. Linus, the immediate successor of St. Peter, wrote a book on the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul. But the assertion of Sigebert lacks proof.

Caius, a Roman priest, afterwards bishop, in the third century, wrote a work against the Montanists, some fragments of which have been preserved by Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> Hermes, a brother of Pope Pius I., wrote a book on the celebration of Easter, according to the statement of trustworthy antiquarians like Liruti and Fontanini. Novatian, before he became a schismatic, wrote a work on the food of the Hebrews, and another on the Trinity, which won for him Papal approval. The greatest, however, of all the Roman writers, who were Christian, during the three first centuries, was Lactantius, who, although he was most probably not a native of the city of Rome, yet was of a Roman family, as he himself tells us. Besides his own statement, his name Lactantius Cœlius or Cecilius, Firmianus, proves his Roman origin; and his style, which is far superior in elegance and purity to that of the Africans Tertullian and St. Cyprian, confirms the probability. His book on the *Death of the Persecutors*, which cannot strictly be called an ecclesiastical work, takes rank among the best histories. His "Divine Institutions," which is a refutation of Gentile superstitions, is, however, purely religious in character.

It should, however, be observed in justice to the Popes who lived during the period antecedent to Constantine, that the turbulence of Rome and of Italy, which destroyed the opportunities for literary pursuits, and the persecutions to which the Church was subjected, prevented them from giving to literature all that time and patronage which under other circumstances they might have given. How could Christians study with persecution, like the sword of Damocles, hanging over their heads? How could Pontiffs find time to encourage letters, when they and their flocks lived in continual peril of their lives? The dead martyrs had to be buried, and the living confessors consoled; the churches had to be built and regulated, and discipline established. In order that literature should flourish there must be peace and prosperity. Owing to the condition of the early Roman Christians, we should not be surprised to find their Greek and African brethren excel them; for in many cases there was less disorder and persecution in places remote from the capital than in it. Speaking, therefore, from a Roman standpoint,

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Eccl., l. ii. cxxv. l. iii. cap. xxvii.

it is not astonishing that in the early ages the foreigners who distinguished themselves among the Christians by their writings, should surpass the natives of Rome. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenæus, Justin, Denis of Alexandria, and others were all Greeks. The Papacy had to travel through the dark days of pagan persecution and immorality, and the invasions of barbarian ignorance before it reached the acme of its literary greatness in the age of Leo X. No matter what might be the natural tastes of the Pontiffs for letters in those early ages, they knew that their first duty was the salvation of souls. They could not cultivate the muses, while they saw around them a sea of infamy and corruption unparalleled in the history of the human race. It was more important in those days to teach the degraded people the principles of the Catechism, to write an epitome of the Bible, than to deal in epic verse or rhetorical eloquence. Who that has read the pages of Tacitus's history, or the satires of Juvenal, both authors of the post-Augustan age, the one a contemporary of the Popes Peter, Linus, Cletus, Clement I., Evaristus, Alexander I., and Sixtus I. (from A.D. 55 to A.D. 117), the other a contemporary of the same Popes except Peter, can fail to realize that the horrible condition of public morals in the Roman capital must have concentrated all the zeal of the Pontiffs in opposition to it? No matter what their tastes or love for literature might have been, they must have felt that the imperial court should be purified first; that the immoral influences of Crispinus, Proculius, Matho, Thymeles, Laronia,<sup>1</sup> and the other educated men and women (*Socratici* as they were called),<sup>2</sup> whose unnatural vices disgraced humanity and Rome, should be first counteracted, and that the rising Church should be guarded from the universal decay that on all sides surrounded her in the decrepit Empire. Considering these circumstances and the fact that the time of the Popes was mostly taken up in the care of the proper administration of the Church, we should not be astonished to find so few of them given to literary pursuits, but rather surprised to find so many Christians cultivating letters in those centuries of persecution. But no sooner was peace given to the Church than the Christians made great progress in literary studies, even so early as the reign of Constantine; a fact which is well proven by the conduct of Julian, the apostate, towards their schools and professors. Having observed that force had not succeeded in destroying Christianity, he determined to degrade it by condemning the Christians to ignorance. Accordingly he made a law prohibiting the Christian rhetoricians and grammarians of the Empire from teaching unless they became pagans. Even Ammianus Marcellinus, although an idolater, calls

<sup>1</sup> Names found in Juvenal's satires passim. .

<sup>2</sup> Sat. II. v. 10.

this law cruel: "*Illud inclemens quod docere vetuit magistros rhetoricos et grammaticos Christianos, nisi transissent ad numinum cultum.*"<sup>1</sup> Julian himself, in one of his letters, mentions this edict.<sup>2</sup> The consequence of it was, that Christian literature was retarded. Some of the ablest Christian professors resigned their chairs, notably Proeresius, a celebrated sophist of Athens, and Marius Victorinus Africanus, a Roman rhetorician. The latter is praised for his sacrifice by St. Augustine.<sup>3</sup> The Christians were prevented not only from teaching school, but even from studying poetry, eloquence, or philosophy, that they might become despicable by their ignorance. The Protestant authors of the old Irish penal laws must have had this edict of Julian in their minds when they set a price on the head of the Irish Catholic schoolmaster. Fortunately for the Christians Julian reigned but a few years. Yet literature of all kinds languished at this time in Rome. The era of decadence had set in. The barbarians were crossing the frontier. Strangers crowded into Rome; and although some brought learning, most of them brought ignorance. The Popes and the Church now became the creators of a new literature as well as of a new civilization; and few have sufficiently appreciated the difficulty of their labor, or the debt of gratitude which is due to them for it. The peace of Constantine, marred for a time by Julian, brought forth abundant fruits in the Church of the fourth and of the beginning of the fifth century. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, in the East, and Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, in the West, supplied the places left vacant by the great pagan writers. The impartial reader must admit that these Christian writers surpass in beauty of sentiment and power of thought all the ancient classical authors. In style only are they perhaps deficient; but this was a natural consequence of the decay of the languages which they spoke owing to the influence of the aggressive and restless barbarians.

It was but natural that in this early golden age of Christian literature the Popes and their immediate dependents should be found conspicuous; and in fact we find at this time the first establishment of parochial schools, sometimes held in the very residence of the bishop. A canon of the Second Council of Vaison, celebrated in the year of our Lord 529, is given by the learned Father Thomasin:<sup>4</sup> "All parish priests, according to the beneficial custom which we know has prevailed throughout the whole of Italy, should keep in their houses young students; and as good fathers, provide for them

<sup>1</sup> Hist., lib. xxii. ch. x. et lib. xxv. ch. iv.    <sup>2</sup> Epist. xlii.    <sup>3</sup> Confess., l. viii. c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Disciplin. de Benef., par ii. lib. i. chap. lxxxviii. No. 10, quoted by Tiraboschi, Lit. It., Tom. II. lib. iv. capo ii. Tiraboschi, Modena edition of 1787, says this council was held in A.D. 526, but this is evidently a printer's mistake.

spiritually by teaching them the psalms and the sacred lessons, and by instructing them in the law of God, so that these students may be worthy to succeed them in the ministry." Thus we perceive that Papal influence, before the sixth century, created the much-esteemed system of parish schools that once flourished over the greater portion of continental Europe.

We find in the fourth century the celebrated Pope Damasus, the patron and prompter of St. Jerome in his learned works on the Holy Scripture. St. Damasus, who governed the Church from A.D. 366 to A.D. 384, was not only remarkable for his prose writings, but for his poetry also. Some of his letters still existing and a number of his sacred epigrams bear witness to the fact. St. Leo the Great, who was Pope from the year 440 to 461, is another of the literary Popes. His letters prove him to have been a man of erudition in profane as well as in sacred questions. He gathered around him all the most learned men of his age; and by their lustre made his court the prototype of that of Leo X. in the sixteenth century. The names of Zeno, bishop of Verona, Philastrius, and Gaudentius of Brescia, Paulinus of Nola, Peter Chrysologus, Ambrose, and Rufinus of Aquileia, and others who flourished about this time, show the Roman sky as usual studded with a galaxy of brilliant stars.

It must, however, be admitted that the style of these writers shows a corrupt taste, and that the influence of the barbarian languages gradually destroyed the purity of the tongue of Cicero and Horace. St. Augustine, in the eighth book of his Confessions, extols the Christian rhetorician, Marius Victorinus Africanus, who taught eloquence in Rome; calls him a learned old man, versed in all the liberal arts, who had read, examined, and explained many of the works of the philosophers, and had translated some of the writings of Plato into Latin; tells us that he was the teacher of many noble senators, and had deserved and obtained by the fame of his professorship a statue in the forum of Trajan. The Saint further tells us how Victorinus was converted into the Christian faith, and made public profession of it in the Church, after following it secretly for awhile. Yet the works attributed to him that remain show him to be inferior to his reputation. Some of them are on rhetoric and grammar, while others are purely of a religious character. This distinguished rhetorician, the master of St. Jerome, was the friend of the Roman Pontiff and scholar, Damasus.

If our purpose in this article were to give an account of the condition of education in the Catholic Church, at different periods of the Pontificate, and by showing that in every age Churchmen strove to advance the cause of learning and science, and then, by inference, to give the credit of each Churchman's efforts, no matter

from what place he might come, to the Papacy as having inspired him, we should have to speak of the Athenian sophists who flourished after the Christian era, as well as of those who were renowned in the West, not only in Rome but in the provinces. A modern author gives an interesting account of the Christian rhetoricians who taught in Athens.<sup>1</sup> When Julian, the apostate, forbade the Christians to teach in the public schools, he made an exception in favor of the celebrated Proeresius, but he (Proeresius) was too generous to stand alone, and though he probably had little in him of the martyr's stuff, he forbore to lecture when his friends were silenced.<sup>2</sup> We should have to speak of the many Christian professors who taught in Milan and Berytus as well as in Rome and Athens; of Symmachus, Donatus, Prudentius, Porphyrius, Proba, and the other Christian poets, *rhetores* and sophists, of the Lower Empire, who kept alive the traditions of the past, and the light of education among the ever-increasing darkness and decadence of the centuries immediately preceding the Middle Ages. But we wish to confine ourselves to the personality of the Popes as much as possible, and show by historical facts what they personally did for the advancement of literature before the eleventh century.

We pass rapidly over the names of Cassiodorus, and the monks who under Papal supervision during the sixth and seventh centuries copied and preserved the classic masterpieces, within the sanctuary of their monasteries, from destruction by the hordes of ignorant barbarians, who overwhelmed the Roman empire, and endeavored to destroy even the vestiges of its civilization. The Papacy during this period of gloom was the pillar of fire which gave light to the struggling nations.

Cassiodorus singles out one name, that of a Roman priest, Dionysius, called the "*Little*," on account of the smallness of his stature, as a proof of the literary culture of the Romans of his time. He calls him "a man versed in Greek and Latin literature; in whom great simplicity is united to great eloquence and learning; a perfect Catholic, and a faithful follower of the traditions of the fathers."<sup>3</sup> This writer was but one of many who still flourished under the fostering care of the Papacy. The line of literary Popes was never broken for any length of time. Yet there is a charge to be answered at this very place against one of the most learned of the early Popes, no less a personage than Gregory the Great. He has been called the Attila of literature in the sixth century by such writers as Brucker.<sup>4</sup> Three charges are made against this great

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Capes, A. M., "University Life in Ancient Athens."

<sup>2</sup> University Life, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup> Cassiodorus de Inst. Div. Liter. c. xxiii.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. Crit. Philos. I, iii. p. 560.

Pontiff, that he drove the mathematicians out of his court; that he burned the Palatine library; and that he discouraged and forbade the study of Belles-lettres. Let us answer them briefly. Who is said to make the accusation that Gregory exiled the mathematicians? John, of Salisbury, who lived six centuries after the Pope. Gregory died A.D. 604; John, A.D. 1180. But what does the monk say? Merely this: "*Doctor Sanctissimus ille Gregorius . . . mathesim jussit ab aula recedere.*" He is the only ancient writer who makes this statement.<sup>1</sup> He does not say that the Christians were forbidden to study mathematics, or that the mathematicians were severely punished, but only sent away from the court. But what were these mathematicians, and what was the nature of the science which they cultivated? John of Salisbury plainly leads us to the inference that they were astrologers, not true mathematicians, and that their so-called science was astrology. Moreover, only that portion of the Palatine library was destroyed which contained books of fortune-tellers, oracles, and false predictions. This also is evident from the words of John of Salisbury: "*Sed ut traditur a majoribus, incendio dedit probatæ lectionis, . . . 'Scripta Palatinus quæcumque tenebat Apollo;' in quibus erant præcipua, quæ cælestium mentem, et superiorum oracula videbantur hominibus revelare.*"<sup>2</sup> From this passage of the writer it is clear that Gregory condemned only false science and superstition, which were then making inroads on the faith, and condemned to the flames only the worthless oracles of paganism. Brucker knew that in ancient times mathematician and astrologer were frequently synonymous terms; and, in fact, he makes this statement in his work.<sup>3</sup>

The Palatine library had been founded for the public use on the top of the Palatine Hill, by the Emperor Augustus. That Gregory burned this library is given as a piece of traditional gossip by the garrulous and not very reliable old monk of the 12th century, John of Salisbury: "*Fertur*"—"it is said"—he writes "that Gregory burned the library." If Gregory did burn it, it was because the books in it were bad. But it is not probable that John of Salisbury writes the truth. We have a life of Gregory written by John the Deacon, a much earlier authority than the English monk, but not a word

<sup>1</sup> Polycrat. l. ii, cxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Idem.

<sup>3</sup> So learned a man as Brucker ought to have known that so early as the time of Tacitus, the mathematicians were put under the ban of even the Pagan law. It is quite evident, from the following passage, that those gentlemen did not confine themselves in those ages merely to the study of figures. "*Urgentibus etiam mathematicis, dum 'novos motus, et clarum Othoni annum, observatione siderum' affirmant: genus hominum potensibus infidum, sperantibus fallax, quod in civitate nostra et retinebitur semper et retinebitur.*" The laconic historian gives them a very bad reputation; perhaps they were no better in Gregory the Great's time. Tacitus, Hist., lib. i. chap. xxii.

does it contain regarding what must have been a very important fact. We may, therefore, class it with other statements made by the same writer, as for instance, that Gregory prayed daily for the Emperor Trajan, and never stopped crying and praying for him until he had obtained the release of the Emperor's soul from the flames of hell!

Nor are we to believe the charge made against Gregory on the authority of writers of the fifteenth century, during the reign of Louis XI., King of France, that Gregory condemned the study of Cicero's and Livy's works. No historian worthy of the name will take the authority of a writer of the fifteenth, for the truth of a fact said to have occurred in the seventh century. Why should Gregory condemn innocent Cicero and Livy to the flames, while he overlooked Ovid, Juvenal, and Horace, who are impure and dangerous to youth, unless read with discretion?

There is a letter of Gregory to St. Leander, prefixed to his commentary on Job, in which he writes of the style and method of the Pagan classics: "*Unde et ipsam artem loquendi quam magisteria disciplinæ exterioris insinuant, servare desepi. Nam sicut hujus quoque epistolæ tenor enuntiat non metatissimi collisionem effugio non barbarismi confusionem devito: situs, motusque præpositionum casusque servare condemno; quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba cælestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.*" But what does this prove but that the great Pontiff was unwilling to sacrifice force and truth to style? That he did not believe that the use of the arts of the rhetorician should be the chief aim of a writer, or that sense should be sacrificed to sound, or to rounded phrases? It is as if a professor of homiletics were to tell his students: "Gentlemen, a simple statement of the truth is better than all the grammatical punctilio of Lindley Murray, or the rhetorical graces of Blair." And in fact, Gregory's writings prove that he was not indifferent to the graces of style. They are remarkable for beauty as well as for force; full of eloquence and even poetry. St. Gregory's modesty alone could make him call himself a barbarous or rough writer. Of him and his court his trustworthy biographer, John the Deacon, writes: "*Videbantur passim cum eruditissimis clericis adhærere pontifici, religiosissimi monachi. . . . Tunc rerum sapientia Romæ sibi templum visibiliter quodammodo fabricarat et septemplex artibus veluti columnis nobilissimarum totidem lapidum Apostolicæ sedis atrium fulciebat. Nullus Pontifici famulantium a minimo usque ad maximum barbarum quodlibet in sermone vel habitu præseferbat, sed togata Quiritum more, sua trabeata Latinitas suum Latium in ipso Latiali palatio singulariter*

<sup>1</sup> Vit. St. Gregory, l. ii. cxii.

*obtinebat. Refloruerant ibi diversarum artium studia.*" Thus do we find the court of the Pontiff filled with refined and cultivated men of letters. John the Deacon lived only two centuries after Gregory, and must, therefore, be considered the better authority in matters concerning the Pope and his age.

Among those learned men of Gregory's court, we should name Claudius, a monk of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome; another was St. Paterius, both authors of note. Pope Leo II., who ascended the Papal throne A.D. 682, was, according to Anastasius the librarian, "a most eloquent man, learned in Greek and Latin, an experienced musician, and a great reader."<sup>1</sup> Gregory II., who died A.D. 731, and Gregory III., who died A.D. 741, were also remarkable for their literary knowledge. Popes Zachary, A.D. 752, Stephen III., also men of letters, finish the history of the eighth century. That Rome still preserved the hegemony of letters is well proved by a fact recorded in the life of Charlemagne. In the year of our Lord 787 he went to Rome and brought back a corps of professors of grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, music, etc., to instruct his people and teach in the schools which he was establishing.<sup>2</sup> The inspiration which the Great Emperor had received at the capital of Christendom soon manifested itself. *Bonum est diffusivum sui.* Schools multiplied. Every parish priest in the empire was obliged to keep school, and teach the children of his parish, "*sans autre rémunération que les dons volontaires des parents.*"<sup>3</sup> In view of well-authenticated facts such as these, how can the assailants of the papacy conscientiously charge the Popes with endeavoring to keep the people ignorant?

The Liber Pontificalis, attributed to Anastasius, the Roman librarian, himself a light of the age, gives us an account of the Popes of the ninth century, and represents them as men worthy to rank on the score of education with the most illustrious successors of St. Peter. Adrian I., Eugenius II., and Gregory IV., were all men of letters. Eugenius II. held a Council at Rome, A.D. 826, in which a decree was promulgated for the establishment of public schools. Leo IV., Nicholas I. and Stephen V., elected Pope A.D. 855, not only were learned themselves, but had courts remarkable for their literary character.

But in the tenth century there was a partial eclipse of science in Rome. The ninth century had died in a blaze of glory, with the arts and sciences flourishing all over Italy. The twilight still lingered around the Imperial City for the first half of the tenth century; nor did the darkness ever become general. It is true that we have

<sup>1</sup> Scrip. Rev. Ital., vol. iii, p. i.

<sup>2</sup> Vie de Charlemagne, by August Vetault, page 396.

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem.



a statement made in the Council of Rheims, A. D. 992, that few in Rome knew at that time the elements of literature. But this assertion was gratuitous, and prompted by one of those local jealousies for which the political divisions and quarrels of the time are an explanation. "*Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*," says Juvenal, and how, therefore, are we to believe that all the learning of the ninth century perished at once and left no progeny. Tiraboschi, a most excellent authority upon this subject, tells us<sup>1</sup> that Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, speaking of Rome at this time, says "that in Rome the sciences still flourished better than elsewhere." The few unfortunate Popes who at that period cast a shadow over the Chair of Peter by their personal delinquencies, did not destroy the light which has always shone around the Capital of Christendom. Otto, Bishop of Vercelli, as well as Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, kept up the reputation of the Church for science and learning. Ratherius died A.D. 974. The study even of Greek literature was not neglected by the Popes, in the very darkest of the so-called dark ages. In the year 816, Pope Stephen IV. founded the monastery of St. Praxedes, and placed in it a congregation of Greek monks, who used their own rite in the celebration of the divine mysteries; and Leo IV. about the same time introduced Greek monks and professors into the monastery of Sts. Stephen and Cassian.<sup>2</sup> Anastasius, the librarian of whom we have already spoken, was an excellent Greek scholar.<sup>3</sup>

Luitprand, a deacon of the Cathedral of Pavia, afterwards Chancellor of King Berenger II., then a courtier in the palace of the German emperor, Otho I., and finally made by him Bishop of Cremona, a bitter partisan of the German faction, has maligned the Popes of the tenth century, and painted it and them in blacker colors than they really deserve. It is true that the Church was then like an athlete, fatigued by many struggles and many triumphs; it is true that each wave of barbarian invasion, as it broke over Christian Italy, filled its plains with ruin and covered civilization with the lava of ignorance; it is true that the Irish missionaries who evangelized Europe in the sixth century had not completely succeeded in converting the savage hordes of feudal freebooters and brutal peasants of Southern Europe; it is true that Rome and Italy were filled in the 10th century with lords, barons, marquises, counts and princes, each the leader of a faction, struggling for power; armed bandits, like the Norman nobles of the twelfth century, recognizing

<sup>1</sup> Storia della Letteratura Italiana. Tom. III. p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> The best authority on this subject is Ozanam's admirable work on "Civilization Among the Franks."

<sup>3</sup> Muratori, Script. Rer. Ital., Vol. III. P. I. p. 215.

no law but violence, and striving to get control of the Papacy as the recognized central source of power, by which they could have the prestige of law in their favor, although they despised it themselves, and thus intimidate their enemies. Rome, it is true, was rent by these feudal faction fights. A few Popes were intruded by force into the See of Peter. Yet, although these causes delayed the progress of letters, they did not completely extinguish their shining. The monasteries, like busy hives, were silently working, preparing to display all their fruits when the period of confusion should have passed away, when peace should be restored, faction and turbulence be quelled, law resume its sway, and the chair of St. Peter its glory, as it did under the immortal Hildebrand. To the calumnies of Luitprand, the enemy of the Popes, we may oppose the truthful statements of Flodoard, a contemporary writer. He shows that in spite of the dangers to which the papacy was subjected by the struggles of the Italian and German parties to control it for political purposes, it seldom was tarnished by dishonor or ignorance, and that most of the charges made by the Germanizing Luitprand are false. Flodoard's authority is sustained by that of John the Deacon, who was his contemporary, and by Leo Marsicanus, who flourished in the following century. Flodoard lived and wrote in the early part of the tenth century, and was learned and unpartisan. His authority is, therefore, of greater weight than that of Luitprand, who was biassed and wrote at a later date.<sup>1</sup>

The clouds of the tenth century soon disappeared, when Pope Sylvester II. ascended the Papal throne. This Pope, at one time abbot of the monastery founded at Bobbio by the Irish monks who had evangelized Gaul in the sixth century, was renowned as a mathematician and musician long before he became Pope. The name of Gerbert, afterwards Sylvester II., will always be an answer to those who accuse the Popes of having been hostile to the cultivation of the natural sciences. There is no longer a doubt about the further development of literary studies. Gregory VII., A.D. 1078, holds a Council at Rome in which all bishops are commanded to open schools, which should be attached to their churches; and the Third General Council of Lateran, held by Alexander III., A.D. 1179, caps the climax of Papal zeal in the cause of education, by ordering that bishops and priests should not only know the sciences becoming to their state, but expressly commands that, in order that the poor shall not remain deprived of the opportunities of learning, in every cathedral church there shall be a master to teach school *gratuitously to all poor scholars*; and that no one should exact a license fee from any such school-teacher. This regulation was after-

---

<sup>1</sup> A noteworthy instance of Luitprand's mendacity is given in the case of Pope Sergius III. *Vide* Wouter's Hist. Eccl. p. 77, edition of Louvain, 1871.

wards incorporated as a portion of the canon law. When we consider that in those days bishops were more numerous than they are now, and that almost every small city had a cathedral church, we must admit that the people of the early portion of the eleventh century could not have been so badly off for the means of education.

We have seen by the words of the Council of Vaison, already quoted (A.D. 529), that parish schools had been established all over Italy, as early as the fifth century, and this decree of Pope Alexander III. continues the noble tradition of the Papacy in favor of the system. The eleventh century begins the history of the great universities of Europe.<sup>1</sup>

There were eight General Councils, and a countless number of particular ones held before the eleventh century. The General Councils were filled with Roman scholars, and presided over by Roman legates. Is there one of them whose decrees do not indicate the work of learned men, and of men remarkable even for the graces of style and diction? The particular Councils were inspired from the same source, and had their value only inasmuch as they were sanctioned by the Popes. Hardly one of these Councils but is occupied with questions regarding education and the means to be taken for its advancement. In what, then, were the Popes opposed to literature? How can rulers who make laws for centuries commanding their subjects to found schools and educate the people gratuitously, be considered foes of science?

The Roman *Bullarium* is an immense work. Volumes are filled with the bulls and briefs and letters of the Roman Pontiffs. Let them be examined, and although we admit that the critic may find in them some evidence of a corrupt taste, owing to the exigencies of the subject and the formulas of the *Curia*, we are certain that his impartiality will admit them to be masterpieces of learning, of logic, theology, philosophy and style. We do not ask him to read the eloquent Bull of Pius IX. defining the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; or the last elegantly written encyclical of Leo XIII.; or to peruse the briefs of the classic Leo X.; but we send him back to the days of Leo I., Gregory I., Agapitus, Gelasius, Damasus, Sylvester II., and Gregory VII., for passages of Ciceronian purity and Demosthenic energy.

Even Hallam, who is, in my opinion, a very bigoted author, is obliged to render justice to the fostering care of the Papacy for

---

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of the universities which began their career in the eleventh century, Hallam says: "From this time the Golden Age of Universities commenced; and it is hard to say whether they were favored most by their sovereigns, or by the *See of Rome*." —Middle Ages, p. 524.

letters : "A continual intercourse was kept up between Rome and the several nations of Europe ; her laws were received by the bishops, her legates presided in Councils ; so that a common language was as necessary in the Church as it is at present in the diplomatic relations of kingdoms."<sup>1</sup> He gives this and the existence of monasteries as the chief means of preserving the ancient classics from destruction during the early portion of the Middle Ages. The facts which we have given corroborate his opinion. The Popes did indeed preserve literature, and promote and protect its growth and progress. The bright light of Christian literature, from the year 118 to 160,<sup>2</sup> when the Christian apologists first made the faith respectable in the eyes of Pagans, by a style and genius equal to their own, grew into the force and splendor of the age of Augustine and Ambrose ; and continued to illuminate the world with undiminished power even to the tenth century. Although then partially eclipsed by the surrounding ignorance of quarrelling barbarians, its rays broke through the clouds. It burst out into greater glory in the eleventh century under the reign of the mathematician and Pontiff, Sylvester II., and has continued unclouded from that day to this, through a line of saints and scholars, statesmen, theologians and poets, founders of schools and universities, through Gregory VII., Alexander III., Honorius III., Boniface VIII., Nicholas V., and Sixtus V., from Leo X., the Mæcenas of the sixteenth century, down to the present philosopher and poet, Leo XIII., whose intellectual brows are graced by the tiara, and whose pen is educating the world.

In modern times England had her golden age of literature under Elizabeth ; France followed with the age of Louis XIV. ; but before them all, and leading the way to all, was the golden age of Papal literature under Leo X. His age was the morning star, the first in the intellectual firmament to tell of the coming apparitions.—"*No-visissimus exit.*"

---

<sup>1</sup> Hallam's Middle Ages, p. 462.

<sup>2</sup> Aubé, Histoire des Persecutions de l'Eglise, t. ii.

## THE RAPID INCREASE OF THE DANGEROUS CLASSES IN THE UNITED STATES.

*The Dangerous Classes of New York City.* By C. L. Brace, New York, 1872.

EVERY sincere lover of his country, who has given more than a passing attention to the moral condition of our people, must experience alarm at the general lowering of the moral tone of the whole community, the increase of vice, the decline of commercial honesty and integrity in men intrusted with legislative, judicial, executive, and financial positions.

Looking lower down in the social scale we find the old body of honest yeomen and solid artisans disappearing, and a vast army growing up of men, women, and children even, who constitute a perpetual menace to the wellbeing of society.

These dangerous classes, the cockle sowed while men slept, are growing with such rapidity as to threaten to suffocate the good grain.<sup>1</sup> Dangerous in all countries, these classes are doubly dangerous with us, inasmuch as the men who belong to them are endowed with the right to vote, and surpassing honest electors in numbers or activity, succeed, and will succeed, in placing in the highest offices men at heart as unprincipled and unscrupulous as themselves, though the vice is gilded with the dress, the manners, the religious tone, of even the healthier portion of our community.

Fifty years ago pauperism was almost unknown in America. The cases were isolated, comparatively few, and not apparently hereditary. Now in every State the poorhouses are crowded with inmates, the country swarms with vagrants and those who, disinclined to work, or failing to secure it, swell their numbers. From this school come by the thousand criminals of every kind, only the opportunity and the knowledge being necessary to transform the tramp into the thief, burglar, incendiary, ravisher, or murderer. Every city has its organized gangs, every member of which has committed a series of crimes, all known more or less to the police force, permitted to exist, to thrive, to influence elections, escape indictment,

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of persons who live in crime and make a vocation of some line of criminal life in the city of New York, and in several of the cities of this State, increases more rapidly than the population. "Now it is a fact that the numbers, the fearlessness and the defiant organization of criminals against property have been increasing these several years past in the city of New York." Thirty-second Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York, pp. 92-3. "The increase of crime is shown by the census of the penal institutions to be assuming very serious aspects." "A statistical summary of the returns from courts of record in the year 1877 shows the important fact that there has been an increase of the classes of crime against property accompanied with violence." Thirty-third Report, p. 6.

trial, conviction, punishment, and constantly to recruit from the idle vagrants.

Every few years public attention is called to some of these ulcers of society. There will be public agitation, meetings will be held, associations formed, and an attempt made to obtain our usual panacea for all evils—new legislation. We have "Societies for Improving the Condition of the Poor," "Prison Aid Societies," "Liquor Prohibition Movements," "Seamen's Aid Associations," "Midnight Missions," "Female Guardian Societies," "Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," as more important, and "to Children," as of less consequence.

We have at this time movements against Chinese heathenism and vice, against Mormonism, against the Oneida Community, against tenement houses.

In all cases we find the idea to be simply to effect moral reformation by natural means—means which have in all times and all countries proved inadequate. The strange crusade of women against intemperance is almost solitary in its recognition of man's inability to redeem man, and his necessity of God's grace to enable him to rise.

The project to "put God into the Constitution," seems to have sprung from a glimmering of the real truth, that as a people we are living without God in the world; but the remedy is not to put the name of the Creator into the paper Constitution, but to imbue the whole social system with the supernatural, the idea of God, its need of Him, its accountability to Him, and a loving desire to fulfil His will.

The wisest of the ancients, in considering the condition of mankind under the rule of paganism, hopelessly confessed the utter inadequacy of all human means of raising it to a better degree. They saw that it was like a man trying to soar in the air by tugging at his own belt; unless a God came to lift man out of the mire and misery into which he was fallen he must perish.

Christianity did this. It took that very heathen world, the polished pagan of Rome and Greece, the barbarous pagan of Britain, Gaul, Germany, and Scandinavia, changed their moral nature, so to say, extirpated vices, elevated the whole tone of Europe, freed the woman and the bondman, established Christian marriage, checked the inordinate pursuit of wealth and pleasure, and by creating higher aspirations gave examples in every condition of life which proved that God gave his graces to those who sought to do His will, enabling human nature by their aid to do what unassisted it must ever fail to accomplish.

For some centuries men have been steadily endeavoring to shake off this idea of Christian influence. The self-sufficiency of man is

the main thought that imbues most modern ideas, and the daily practical refutation it encounters does not seem to weaken in the least the popular belief. The consequence is the gradual undoing of the work of Christianity and the relapse of the nations into the condition of the old heathen world, without even the distorted idea of divine dependence which pervaded it.

The Reformation was a revolt against the idea of the supernatural. All radicals, free-thinkers, infidels, point to it as the commencement of man's disenthralment. The Protestant denominations, as they took form and cohesion, had to retain at first much that their doctrines did not include, and much of doctrine and practice that was gradually cast aside by succeeding generations.

In our own country we all know how strong the religious element was in forming the various little communities out of which our Republic grew, and how completely it has ceased to be a potency in our present State and General Governments, except so far as it is kept alive for the purpose of annoying Catholics or proselytizing. But for the presence of Catholicity in the country there would not be a sign of Christianity left.

With this general religious decline in America, came the steadily increasing worship of worldly prosperity and success. This has become in the minds of the masses of our countrymen the great test of true religion. We could cite volume after volume, in which the thrift, prosperity and wealth of Protestant communities are adduced as proof that Protestantism is the true religion, while poverty stamps the Catholic communities as being far from Christ.

That the view is utterly untenable and absurd, if the life and conduct of our Lord is considered, seems to make no difference. Although He chose poverty in His birth, poverty in life, the poor as His Apostles and disciples, secured not even comfort, much less wealth, for the mother whom He loved with a love no human heart can fathom; although every discourse breathes detachment from earthly things, and warnings against the accumulation of wealth, we are called upon by men who profess to be guided by the Scripture alone, to make this very devotion to this world's goods the highest test of virtue. Benjamin Franklin was in his day the great propagator of these ideas, and they have permeated our whole national life.

The fruit has been as pernicious as the tree. As the religious idea implanted in the colonies declined this took its place. In New England, for instance, in the old time, each town was a little community, contented, self-supporting. Distinctions of wealth were little regarded; the articles of clothing and food, furniture, vehicles, implements, were manufactured on the spot; the son was

content to follow the business of his father; the daughter did not expect to rise higher socially than her mother.

Now, the rural population depends on the great cities. Nothing is woven or spun on the farm; no furniture or implements made in the village. All come from some large city. Even supplies of food raised in the same county must come from town. With none of the old avenues of employment open, with the yearning for wealth that is inculcated almost from the cradle, the sons of the farmer and the mechanic disdain to follow the avocations of their fathers. They aim at something higher. The daughters, in the same spirit, vie with the butterflies of fashion in the cities and shrink from marriage with one of their own position. Of course, with this result, the education of a family becomes a fearful burden compared with former days. Children are dreaded, not welcomed. With the religious sentiment weakened crime begins in the household to prevent large families, thus deadening still more the moral sense.

As the sons would no longer till the soil, ply the plane or the sledge, or the shuttle, or maintain the fisheries, for which New England has always had a kind of idolatry, foreigners have flocked in to do the work which young Americans would not do, and girls came from other lands to do the work which the American born will no longer touch. Where some had attempted to hold on to the old customs, they found it impossible to compete with the new-comers, trained to harder work, poorer fare, and more slender remuneration.

The young men, all more or less educated in the common schools, feel above trades. They crowd our cities, overstock the professions and the houses of commerce. With little moral strength they enter the race where scheming, craft, cunning, and sharp dealing take the lead. The failures are more numerous than the successes.

Where moderate success is the lot of the young man, his desire to appear well increases, and as competition lowers his income, temptation comes. Debts are dishonestly incurred, contracts made with no intention of fulfilment, speculation, defalcation, fraud, and forgery lure many on deeper and deeper, and until exposure comes suddenly in middle life or as age approaches; and they sink to the lowest depths of moral degradation, even if they escape the punishment.

The multiplication of machines, the erection of factories, has contributed to the same result, and has doubtless by numerous failures sunk immense amounts of capital. These factories, seeking to reduce cost to the lowest possible amount, pay wages that offer no adequate inducement to the young people of the country, and again emigration supplies the unskilled labor. Irish, Cana-



dians, and Germans run New England factories, and Portuguese conduct her fisheries.

Our new States, the rich mines developed in California and the Rocky Mountain ranges, draw off many of the native rural population, of the disappointed class, or of those who shrink from earnest, steady labor, but hope to succeed by hook or crook. Yet numbers remain, numbers of vicious and apathetic, sinking lower and lower, till they become criminals by inheritance, or criminals by habit, all the more dangerous as they retain national characteristics of aptness, readiness, and persistency.

Even in comparatively new States, like Indiana, we are startled to find hereditary crime entailed through several generations. One of the journals of the capital of that State, entering into horrifying details, resulting from a thorough study of several cases in that city, says: "These people can hardly be said to have the intellect of the human family, but are like four-footed animals, guided more by instinct than intelligence." "Everything has been done that can be done by various benevolent institutions and societies, in hope of bettering their condition, but to no avail; they are still with us, spreading disease, pauperism, and crime."<sup>1</sup>

Reports of prison associations contain a mass of evidence in regard to the growth and entailment of crime in degenerating and degraded families and communities in interior counties of New York and other States. Mountain districts exist where no word of religious instruction seems ever to penetrate, where families live in a state of crime that can find no parallel in the most savage nations.

Similar reports come from all sections of the country, admitting alike the fact of the existence of this class, their increase and the utter failure of mere human means of remedy.

In the South, in times of slavery, the failures in society created the class of poor whites, shrinking from work that was done by slaves, becoming more ignorant and more debased with each generation, ignorant of religion to an extent that would scarcely be credited. In more northern States a rural population almost as bad has grown up, with an almost utter ignorance of the natural and revealed truths, and with scarcely a single aid against temptation to vice.

The churches, catching the spirit of the time, become more costly and luxuriant; the clergy are more men of the world; the poorer classes find that they are out of place in the new fine structures, or that they are not well-dressed enough to attend. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Indianapolis Saturday Herald, March 1, 1879.

Protestant churches have thus gone on isolating themselves from the poorer classes, exercising less and less influence over them; while at the same time they fail to win the young men even of the more wealthy, in whom the want of moral training is too evidently seen.

The Methodists and Baptists arose about the time these various causes began to act upon the population of this country. Their field was mainly among the poorer classes, and they undoubtedly contributed to keep alive a feeling of religion where the less sympathetic systems had lost all power. But they too have yielded to the influence of the times; the plain, earnest preachers have given place to better educated and more polished men, who do not reach the hearts of the poorer classes; over whom they are gradually losing all influence. Their plain meeting-houses are replaced by costly structures, to maintain which requires the cultivation of wealthy members; men are drawn in to take an active part, not in view of their religious and moral character, but in view of what they may give.

All these causes have tended to increase rapidly the comparative numbers of poor Americans, and leave them morally and religiously as destitute as they are in a worldly sense. With the decay of family devotion and religious instruction in families, the breaking up of marital and family ties by divorce, and the permitted growth of licentiousness, as well as the utter absence of religious influence in the schools,<sup>1</sup> the generations trained in these latter years are almost without either ideas or principles, as the prevalence of juvenile crimes but too sadly attests.

Thus church and school alike fail to exercise any salutary influence over this class of poor, who with every incentive to vice held out to them have nothing to help them to resist temptation. The Protestant churches in fact repel them. In the more prosperous American churches, in the regions to which modern styles of dress and living have extended, there are now but few poor people, and these feel more and more each year that the church is no home for them. There is for them, usually, no fraternal association with their more fortunate neighbors in the church, no wholesome, natural, cordial relation between them as human beings or breth-

---

<sup>1</sup> The truth is, that the multiplication of "educated criminals," so-called, shows the urgency of moral as well as mental training in our schools and colleges. Had "California Jack," who recently argued his own case so ably on appeal to the Supreme Court as to obtain a new trial, known as much about the Ten Commandments as he knows about the State statutes, he might not now be in prison on a charge of burglary. The trouble is, not that men are uneducated, but that the moral and religious sentiments are too much neglected in our modern educational system.

ren. And there is a very large class, who are not extremely poor, but who are obliged to dress plainly and to practice rigid economy in order to obtain the necessities of life.<sup>1</sup>

This is so true that the Protestant church member falling into poverty and want, feels that he has lost all claim to spiritual care. The poor constantly feel their spiritual want. A Jesuit priest temporarily giving aid in a crowded city parish, had a sick-call just as he was about to retire, after a day spent in laborious visitations of the sick and distressed. It was long past the hour fixed by the rules of the parish, and he was about to direct inquiry as to the urgency of the case, when the servant told him that the person at the door was a colored man. As he knew no colored Catholics in the parish his curiosity was excited and he went to the door, where he found a very intelligent colored man.

He said that there was a lady dying at his rooms, who wished to see a clergyman, and that he had called to see whether one of the priests would not come.

"Is she your wife or sister?"

"Oh, no, sir, she is a lady—she is a white lady."

"Are you Catholics?"

"No."

"Then why do you come here?"

"Well, sir, this lady has been sick a good while; when her husband was a rich merchant down town, I was porter in his store; but he failed and died. She was very poor, and her friends all left her. She tried to make a living by sewing, but got paralyzed, and when I found it all out, I took her home and have done all I could for her. She is very low now, and wants a clergyman. She said 'it would be of no use to send to the minister of the church she used to attend on Fifth Avenue, and she did not suppose any of the ministers she used to know would come to her, now that she was so poor.' 'Well,' said I, 'Catholic priests go anywhere, they do not care how poor a person is, or how poor the place is,' and as she said she would like me to try, I have come here."

The priest went, of course, and Father Soderini's account is given only to show the feeling of isolation in the hearts of a large class of Protestant poor.

This alienation from the churches of the poorer American, and to some extent of the class who are struggling rather than poor, has been highly injurious. "Many," says the writer we have already quoted, "who are thus separating themselves from the churches, are injured by the change. They enjoy greater freedom from restraint, and often sink to a life of less strenuous effort at self-direc-

---

<sup>1</sup> Atlantic Monthly, October, 1878.

tion. They do not feel bound to resist temptation or deny appetite its gratifications."

A curious proof of the alienation of the lower strata of society from the Protestant churches, was seen in the general censure of a Brooklyn clergyman, who personally investigated the criminal classes.

His object was, perhaps, merely to afford a new sensation, but the censure bestowed upon him, revealed the fact that his associates in the ministry generally prided themselves on knowing nothing, and resolved by determining to know nothing, of the great ulcer of vice which is striking at the very vitals of our American social system. That any clergyman should have attempted to see what sin was, seemed unpardonable. Strange moral physicians! How blind, indeed, must be their treatment!

The Catholic priest, the Sister of Charity or Mercy, goes to the bedside of the repenting sinner, no matter how poor, no matter how fallen. How their hearts shrink within them God alone knows, as passing amid incarnate vice they reach the sufferer, enveloped in an atmosphere of their own that seems to leave its fragrance behind, and often leads to conversions, amendment, a total change in hearts that seemed utterly depraved, as in the case of Francis of Hieronymo, where a shameless woman, who openly mocked at him and his preaching, fell at his feet a sincere penitent, on beholding her pet dove fly from her arms and nestle on the mission cross, with its head turned to the Saint, as if listening to the words she despised.

Thus the Protestant churches have lost or are rapidly losing all hold on the poor. Religion in practice and theory is fast dying out among them. Without religion to guide them by her light and strengthen them by her ordinances, crime must make vast inroads among them. And it has done so in spite of all the advantages which our government and our social system are supposed to afford.

Had the standard of morality in the more cultivated classes been maintained, there would be a potent force of good example influencing those less liberally endowed with means and education, but unfortunately this is not the case. The higher class is itself gradually falling, and falling rapidly, in a moral point.

"Multitudes of Protestants who are professedly religious are not honest nor trustworthy. They declare themselves fit for heaven, but they will not tell the truth nor deal fairly with their neighbors. The money of widows and orphans placed under their control, is not safer than in the hands of highwaymen." . . . "They are not usually scrupulously truthful or conscientious, and do not believe

it possible to maintain a very high standard of justice or honesty in business life."

While all these causes were exercising their deleterious influence on the lower strata of American society, the higher were becoming more and more godless.

A writer in a leading New England periodical, treating on the subject a few months since, says: "There are still, of course, many truly religious people in the churches, who sincerely believe the old doctrines embodied in all the creeds. But these are everywhere a small minority, and they are mournfully conscious that the old religious life and power have departed from the church. . . . These people, who thus represent the better element of a former state of things, are the real strength of the evangelical Protestant churches, so far as religion is concerned. . . . They live pure and good lives. They speak the truth, a rare virtue now, and they can be trusted with anybody's money. . . . But they are too few to regenerate the American church, . . . and their number and strength diminish from year to year."

"The influence of the churches and of religion upon the morals and conduct of men has greatly declined, and is still declining. There is yet, as I have said, a large amount of moral force and healthful life in the churches. Religion is not extinct. But the really significant fact here is that it is constantly losing ground. The empire of religion over human conduct, its power as a conservative moral and social force, is so far lost, that some things which are indispensable to the existence of society can no longer be supplied from this source without a great increase of vitality in religion itself. The morality based upon the religion popularly professed has, to a fatal extent, broken down."<sup>1</sup>

Protestantism in reality never was able to live except by employing the power of the State to enforce its doctrines and discipline. When that power is taken away, it must decline; it has no doctrine which it can infallibly say men must believe, nor ordinances which it can say men must practice to be saved.

As it is left to each one to decide for himself, less and less is done, and the interest dies out. The earlier colleges in the country, like the early schools, were all deeply religious. The New England Primer contained many of the truths necessary for salvation, and they were impressed on the mind from the youngest class in school to the highest in college.

Now, religion is banished from the schools; the colleges of old date are rapidly throwing aside religious influence and becoming

---

<sup>1</sup> Atlantic Monthly, October, 1878.

- rationalistic; the new collegiate institutions established under the auspices of the State, and not of Protestant denominations, especially at the West, are absolutely unchristian in their tendency, and send out young men imbued with all the scientific objections to Christianity, without any definite ideas of what the fundamental truths of Christianity are.

Thus throughout our social system there is a sweeping away of the religious basis of life. The commandments of God are scarcely known, and do not come to the mind as something that must be obeyed.

There is no guarantee of moral conduct: men avoid vice from absence of temptation, not from any love of God and virtue or from desire for a higher and better life.

Prayer is becoming something unknown. Whether a person of some education or one of the poorer and more ignorant class sees death suddenly menace him, there seems to be an utter absence of all idea of the responsibility of man to his Creator.

The lingering idolatry of the Bible, makes him call for some one to read a passage taken at random, as though it could act as a kind of charm; another is asked to pray, and searches his memory for some words of prayer learned in childhood. That the man himself should awaken sorrow in his heart for sin, love for that God who has so long spared him in his disobedience, and who still gives him time to repent and return, is rarely the case. In fact, the fundamental ideas of religion, of man's responsibility to God, of the enormity of sin and its punishment seem lost. And if they cannot be aroused in the face of death, they surely can exercise little moral influence in ordinary life.

Thus our whole social system tends to increase vice and crime. The more cultivated classes, trained more or less to rationalism or indifference, with a religion that has lost all power for good, are kept within bounds only by human considerations, and these are but frail barriers against vice. The poor, isolated more and more from religious influence, are fast losing all ideas of Christianity, and laying aside every vestige they have hitherto retained.

We cannot, therefore, wonder at the increase of dishonesty and profligacy in the higher classes, or the grosser vices of those beneath them.

Let us now consider the foreign element in this country, and its moral condition.

The first great emigration here was Irish and Catholic. It was in the main pure, virtuous, healthy in body and mind, industrious, anxious for work. Its faults arose from a convivial disposition, making it easily led to excess in drink, and then quarrelsome and noisy. That its good qualities far counterbalanced the bad, cannot be

disputed. Every sound principle of political economy dictated that the community into which the immigrants came should do all to increase every moral influence tending to control the evil and augment the good. Unfortunately, a mingled hatred and contempt for the Irish character had been fostered from early days in New England, and spread more or less through the country. One need but read the "Simple Cobbler of Agawam" to see how unchristian and almost diabolical feelings were nurtured in the hearts, not of ignorant New England colonists, but of the clergy who considered themselves the "salt of the earth." A writer who has inherited no little of this old feeling, although he cloaks it through policy, Brace, admits that "the Irish are at home one of the most law-abiding and virtuous of populations;" and he says truly: "There is no question that the breaking of the ties with one's country has a bad moral effect, especially on a laboring class. The emigrant is released from the social inspection and judgment to which he has been subjected at home, and the tie of Church and priesthood is weakened. If a Roman Catholic, he is often a worse Catholic, without being a better Protestant. If a Protestant he often becomes indifferent. Moral ties are loosened with the religious. The intervening process which occurs here between his abandoning the old state of things and fitting himself to the new, is not favorable to morals or character."

To make the new-comer in time a useful citizen sound reason would dictate to strengthen as far as possible the influence of religion over him, to shield him from temptations peculiar to his condition as a stranger, and to make him confide in those who had been his trusted and best guides. But unfortunately the very opposite course was adopted; Protestant clergy and laity, individually and by means of societies, often ostensibly for charitable objects, but always proving to be proselytizing when you come to scrutinize their work, as well as by means of schools, by ridicule, mockery, caricatures, and sneers, sought first and foremost, at all times and seasons, to weaken the faith of the Irish Catholic, to make him ashamed of his religion, unmindful of the dictates of his own conscience and the counsels of his clergymen, indeed, as Brace says, "a worse Catholic without being a better Protestant." The influence of this system on our separated brethren themselves has been mischievous. It has led them to hesitate at no falsehood or calumny where Catholics are concerned, to falsify statistics, to give a false coloring to the most innocent things, in fact to lower the standard of truth in an incalculable degree, and in the lower classes to produce much vice and crime. Men and women who prided themselves on their exalted Christian character gave time, money, influence to this terrible work, which has wrought incalculable evil to the

country. While they congratulated themselves in their coteries and reports on the good they were doing, they were, in fact, building up a criminal class, devoid of religion and conscience, who though they lost religion yet kept through life a deadly hatred of those to whom they ascribed its loss.

We speak of their work as past; but it is still going on, as it has gone for years. In many States the penal and eleemosynary institutions are proselytizing houses where every Catholic is deprived of means of worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience, deprived of means of instruction in his own faith, and of the consolation afforded by the ordinances of his Church, compelled to learn a system of religion repugnant to him, and to join in its exercises. This makes the victims certainly worse Catholics or no Catholics at all, but it never makes them sincere Protestants, and they escape or are discharged from these houses, at last, with a sense of wrong and a desire of vengeance.

Thousands of emigrants with their moral sense thus dulled, taught hypocrisy, or finding themselves objects of contempt, met two temptations. First, the unchecked and unlimited sale of liquors, of the worst and most dangerous character, was urged on them at every turn, and at last it was as a lethean draught to stifle what conscience remained. Their convivial character, ignorance of the real nature of the liquors, all led them on. Brawls, assaults, petty riots, degradation followed, and these offences, great in numbers though not in degree, make the Irish present a formidable appearance in our criminal returns. Unfortunately the influence of liquor extended to their poor homes, and the result was terrible. Among a people naturally affectionate and kind the wife would be struck down in death by her husband. The innocent girl whom he wooed in an Irish village with a heart as guileless as his own, whom he married before the altar, seeking strength from God through the Sacraments of the Church, lies murdered at last in America by his own hand.

And yet before the judgment-seat of God, some of that blood-guilt rests on those who bent all their higher cultivation, their wealth and social influence to weaken the religious influence in that man's soul, and expose him to unguarded temptation.

The elective franchise proved another bane. Politicians welcomed him and used him; while cajoling him with high-sounding phrases, they degraded him into a mere party tool, and unprincipled men without conscience or religion were raised to office by the votes of Irish Catholics, giving deep offence to the better portion of the community. The political meetings, the inevitable bar-room, the corruption of our whole system, with its primary meetings, its caucuses, its false registries, ballot-stuffing, falsifica-



tion of returns, all tended to deaden every sense of virtue and honesty. Men trained in this school soon ceased to approach the Sacraments or even to enter the Church to hear Mass. Religion and its ministry became powerless to control or guide them, till perhaps grace in some moment of trial touched their hearts.

While these causes tended to destroy the male emigrant, the female portion of the new-comers had their special dangers. Though even their enemies admit that "the Irish female laboring class are well known to be at home one of the most virtuous in the world," their very innocent and unsophisticated nature made them more easily duped. Most of them were young inexperienced girls, exposed on shipboard, in the boarding-house where they sought a temporary home, and in the houses where they sought service, to the wiles and even violence of unprincipled men. That some would fall was to be expected, but the number on the whole was comparatively small.

The German emigration, which came later, was not to so great a degree of the poorer peasant class; it contained a far greater number of families, and of trained artisans, persons of some education, entitled in their own country to practice certain trades or branches of commerce. Fewer girls came apart from their families. United in language the German Catholic and non-Catholic supported each other, and were less easily influenced by the proselytizer, who excited the scorn of the German free-thinker, and found himself what he too often made the Irish Catholic, the butt of ridicule. The unprincipled politician found it less easy to manage a German than an Irish body of voters.

The German Catholics have shown more eagerness for knowledge, supporting schools, periodicals, and papers to an extent that is not only creditable to them, but really a reproach to English-speaking Catholics.

An Italian emigration, which, since the new order of things has obtained in the peninsula, flows in upon us, is by no means healthy. It contains a large element that belonged to the dangerous class in their own country; that has introduced a new kind of bondage, the *padrone* system; is imbued with the communistic theories and vices, and is utterly at variance with the principles of order and submission to divine authority, on which the communities forming this country were founded.

In fact, besides the regular emigration of honest people seeking to secure by industry comfortable homes in this country, there is a steady criminal emigration. New York, the great centre of emigration, sought to check this invasion, but its system has been declared unconstitutional, and the country is comparatively unprotected. Some European states at one time endeavored actually

to empty their prisons on our shores. Even now, to cite the words of the Prison Association of New York: "The professional criminals of the whole civilized world would make New York a rendezvous. The British cracksmen and thieves, the professional thieves from France, Italy, and Germany, and various classes of persons who have lived by crime in Europe, organize crime and live by it in New York."<sup>1</sup>

The increasing method and system in Europe for watching those known to be inclined to commit crime, with the constant supervision exercised over suspicious characters, make them readily seek a refuge in this country, where the criminal classes enjoy such immunity, and so easily escape the punishment due their misdeeds.

Yet, although New York has a larger proportion than many States of foreign population, nearly sixty-one per cent. of the prisoners in the penitentiaries during the year 1877 were native born, showing, says an official report, "that the foreign born inhabitants are no longer chargeable with the great excess of common crimes which is sometimes attributable to them in this State."

In California and on the Pacific coast generally, the children of the poorer classes find themselves cut out from employment by the introduction of Chinese labor. This element has the attractiveness of cheapness, but it will be excessively dear to the country, if it increases, as it has, the native born idle and criminal class. Were it a pure element, healthy in body and in morals, it would be bad enough, but it is essentially demoralizing, if we are to credit those who have studied it in California, and who base their judgment on what they have seen there with their own eyes—a very different criterion from acquaintance with better classes in China. Congress recently passed a law to check to some extent the future emigration of Chinese, and though the act was returned by President Hayes with his veto, the subject will certainly come up again.

It is a difficult question to deal with under our system of government, but the fact remains that the Chinese element introduces new forms of vice, and tends to augment the number of the unemployed, and increase their temptations to crime.

Our great cities have corrupting influences of their own, and none perhaps greater than the overcrowded tenement houses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Records show that the proportion of foreign-born criminals is not only in excess; but the crimes against property are connected with that class of prisoners that seem to have floated into this State as criminals, that is, the cracksmen and burglars.—Thirty-second Annual Rep. P. A. of N. Y., p. 83.

The high prices of real estate of late years, caused by the inflation of paper money, made it impossible for the poor to secure any homes except in these houses. Their work was in the cities and they had to reside there. Even at the lowest rates of commutation, it took too much money and too much time for the workingman to venture to live in the country where he could have a small cottage, for what two rooms cost him in New York. Philadelphia, Chicago, and some other cities encouraged the erection of cheap houses for the working class, by offering premiums for the best and most reasonable plan; but the movement has not been general.

Although there are cases, and by no means few, where families living in these conditions retain their early religious and moral tone, and bring up their children properly, we must on the whole admit that tenement-house life has been the great hotbed of vice. Where these structures abound liquor saloons abound, in which the vilest compounds are sold. Intoxication and the vices that follow in its wake, are a constant spectacle. Men, women, and children, who enter these houses, soon become habituated to vice in every form. Women, girls lose all modesty and shame, and in a few years sink to the lowest depths.

It need not be said that with overcrowding such as this, there is always disease and, as naturally, crime. The privacy of a house is undoubtedly one of the most favorable conditions to virtue, especially in a girl.

But in New York, in 1868, the number of the tenement-houses was 18,582, containing a population estimated at five hundred thousand, one-half of all living on the island.

If a female child be born and brought up in a room of one of these tenement-houses, she very early loses the modesty which is the great shield of purity. Personal delicacy becomes almost unknown to her. Living, sleeping, and doing her work in the same apartment with men and boys of various ages, it is wellnigh impossible for her to retain any feminine reserve, and she passes almost unconsciously the line of purity at a very early age.

The boys thrown with thieves, and pickpockets, and criminals of deeper dye, hear their vaunts, and begin to admire them. The police authority becomes something to be defied. Many become petty thieves, truants, street-rovers, beggars.

Of the younger criminals in our prisons, a very large percentage begin life in the crowded tenement-houses, where the only home was a room, and the only play-ground the streets.

The public schools are maintained by the taxes levied on all, and should, it might be supposed, afford a means for the children of the poor occupants of such places to acquire an education, and fit them for self-support; but in point of fact the public schools repel as far

as possible the children of the very poor. They have become schools for the children of the wealthier classes, whose parents do not wish them to associate with the children of tenement-houses. What is done for this class is done almost entirely by the Catholic parochial schools; and in New York within a few years Trinity Church has extended widely its schools to take in those virtually excluded from the public schools.

The course of study in these State institutions is peculiarly unfitted to the children of the poor. It is adapted to the children of the middle and wealthy classes, and is in no respect a suitable preparation for a life of toil.

It makes the young discontented, ashamed of their parents, and eager for show and display, and is all the more dangerous as no religious influence exists, no word of heavenly things, of higher or nobler aims than this world, is ever imparted.

The son of the mechanic trained there is ashamed to learn a trade. He has been taught to look higher. If even better influences have prevailed, and he seeks at last to learn a trade, new difficulties await him. Trades-unions exist in almost every branch of business, and these dictate to employers, and prevent the engagement of apprentices. Union men cannot, by the rules of these tyrannical associations, work in a shop where more than a certain number of boys are kept. The consequence is that in many trades the willing boy finds the door closed upon him. Anxious to acquire the means to enable him to earn a livelihood, he finds that no one will or dare receive him. He has perhaps learned to play on the piano, or has acquired a smattering of so-called intellectual philosophy or the derivation of words at the public school, but he has not learned how to handle a tool, or acquired a single idea that will enable him to earn his living by the labor of his hands. The boy who has learned his trade in his foreign home, steps into the shop as a worker, while the boy born among us, though eager and willing to work, has to stand idle, and in this idleness falls a prey to vice. Thus the public school becomes as regards this class of boys a school for tramps and desperadoes.

One who has labored among the homeless boys of one of our large cities, says that the task of reformation was for a time disheartening, difficulties presenting themselves that were unexpected in boys of tender years. "There seems to be a spirit of adventure among them that will not hesitate at incendiarism, and will at times prompt them to present a loaded revolver for some fancied offence. Their ideas are communistic to an extreme degree, and they will assuredly pull down houses about our ears, if not repressed seasonably and with determination." "These boys are not acquainted

with fear, have sometimes to learn the sanctity of an oath, and look on the laws of society as enacted for their oppression."<sup>1</sup>

This result has been gradual. The boy who is spirited and full of adventure, has the elements which ought to make him a good and valuable member of the community; but, trained in a school where religion is excluded, finding avenues for self-support cut off, his aspirations to help a widowed mother perhaps checked, he feels that he and she are alike wronged by society, and, leaving her in her wretched room in a tenement-house, he takes to the street. In many cases he plunges into vice; occasionally he falls under the control of those who will endeavor to save him by implanting sound religious principles in his head and heart, but if a Catholic he frequently here becomes a prey to the hypocritical proselytizer. Children's Aid Societies and similar associations which, when seeking money, disclaim all sectarian or proselytizing intentions, boast among themselves, and occasionally in their reports betraying their inborn hate of the Catholic religion, of the number of Catholic children whom they have removed from all Catholic influence. Benevolence is only a mask, proselytism is the soul, kept alive by an undying hatred of Catholic truth. Let any one collect the reports of the various so-called benevolent associations, and go through them carefully, and he will at once see distinct indications.

So convinced are Catholics of the bad faith of all these movements, of the utter want of principle underlying them, as criminal in itself as the crimes they pretend to remedy, that they are compelled to stand aloof and do what they can in their own way, forced to combat the increasing vice and crime and at the same time counteract as far as they can the efforts of those who, sooner than see a Catholic on the downward path saved by the influence of his religion, move heaven and earth to extirpate all sense of that religion from his heart.<sup>2</sup>

The civil war, which so recently desolated our land, contributed in no small degree to a general increase in crime. The hundreds of thousands of workmen called away from factory and bench to the excitement of army life, with its long periods of inactivity, underwent a training that made to many the old life of steady habits, dull and insupportable. Many there acquired habits of vice, and a dis-

<sup>1</sup> Report of St. Vincent's Home for Boys. Brooklyn, 1878.

<sup>2</sup> Brace, in his "Dangerous Classes," attempts to deny the charge of proselytizing brought against the Children's Aid Societies, and says: "Both Catholic and Protestant homes were offered freely to the children," but his work and the reports teem with violent abuse of the Catholic clergy and Church, and in all the correspondence given as from children sent West, we have been unable to find one from a Catholic child in a Catholic family; and we may well hesitate to believe until lists are given that we can examine.

regard of the lives and property rights of others. Many came back who had passed through the ordeal unscathed, yet with seeds of disease enervating their system, rendering steady work impracticable. During the war, as the currency was inflated, there was great activity in many branches of trade, artisans from other parts filled the places of those who were enlisted or drafted, and when they returned, many could not find employment; then as money resumed its old channels, years of financial distress came, and factory and workshop stood idle, leaving two sets of workmen unemployed. Men roamed from place to place seeking work. Accustomed to be away from their families, domestic ties were broken, men became alienated from their wives and children, and easily caught at any pretext to escape responsibility for their support. Failing to secure work they became tramps and vagrants, and the whole country is overrun by armies of these men, who grow more lawless day by day, often congregating in numbers sufficient to plunder railroad trains or small communities.

"As we utter the word *tramp* there arises straightway before us the spectacle of a lazy, shiftless, sauntering or swaggering, ill-conditioned, irreclaimable, incorrigible, cowardly, utterly depraved savage," says Professor Wayland. "He fears not God, neither regards man. Indeed he seems to have wholly lost all the better instincts and attributes of manhood. He will outrage an unprotected female, or rob a defenceless child, or burn an isolated barn, or girdle fruit trees, or wreck a railway train, or set fire to a railway bridge, or murder a cripple, or pilfer an umbrella, with equal indifference, if reasonably sure of equal impunity. Having no moral sense he knows no gradations in crime. He dreads detection and punishment, and he dreads nothing else."

"Recent investigations by the State detective force of Massachusetts have led to the conclusion that the great body of tramps are professional thieves. Moreover, these officials have reason to believe that such vagrants are formed into organized gangs, under the direction of skilful leaders, with general headquarters in the western part of the State, where their plunder is deposited and divided."<sup>1</sup>

In the railroad riots a few years since the country was appalled to see what armies of tramps seemed to gather, as if by magic, ready for any deed of violence; and a general sense of the danger menacing society prevailed. Yet the matter has been allowed to drop out of sight, and no adequate remedy has been undertaken.

---

<sup>1</sup> Papers on Outdoor Relief and Tramps, pp. 10, 15.

The war threw upon their own resources the slave population of the South, which, in bondage, had been compelled to labor while able, and in sickness and age was supported. Emancipation left them free to avoid labor, and they had never felt any obligation to support their aged or infirm relatives. Crime increased among them to a fearful extent, and some forms, especially of violence to women, seemed to come from some organized system, directing it either from the South or the North. Politics, too, drew even those disposed to work away from the paths of industry, and the harangues of unscrupulous politicians inflamed their minds, while liquor freely given contributed to ruin them. A criminal class, or criminal-breeding class was at once formed, which is increasing and at times overawes the well-disposed colored men.

The increasing irreligion of the poorer classes is seen to be at the bottom of almost all the increase of vice. It is due to the vicious nucleus, to the unchecked selling of liquor, to the corrupting influence of politicians, to the license given to houses of ill-fame, to the crowding in tenement houses, and to the course of unscrupulous proselytizers.

If any clearheaded social scientist ever puts to himself the question, "Does proselytizing pay?" his answer will be that it is sowing the storm to reap the whirlwind, and that it is one of the greatest curses of the American social system.

This hostility to our faith, and the proselytism which this hostility engenders and which in turn engenders it, must also be taken into consideration as one of the causes of crime. That we Catholics suffer by it is not all. It blinds many of our separated brethren to all considerations of truth and honor, to respect for the good name and property of others. Led away by this hatred, which so far as they personally are concerned is baseless, for they have no wrongs suffered at our hands, they think everything allowable, so long as it is employed against the Catholic Church, and that everything done or attempted by Catholics must be thwarted.

The facility with which men and women of education, and one would suppose animated by some feelings of Christianity, were led to countenance, circulate, and defend such impostures as *Maria Monk*, *Six Months in a Convent*, *The Escaped Nun*, and similar books, replete with falsehood and immorality, shows that respect for truth and morality was for the time lost. They injured us in our good name, but they injured those who circulated them far more. To connive at falsehood, in one case, lowered their general respect for truth. It made social and commercial falsehood all the more easy. A man who can aid in circulating a lie will easily tell one.

The constant use of insulting names applied to us, "Romanist,"

"Romish," "Popish," and the like, shows a disregard for our good name, in that it endeavors to degrade us in the eyes of our fellow-men. Those who use these epithets will soon go further; they will prevent a Catholic from getting employment solely on the ground of his religion, and will strain a point to lower his good name to effect the end. The point is soon reached where the robbery or burning of Catholic property, if not stimulated by words and connived at, is secretly exulted over. And these cases are not rare. A million of dollars probably will not cover the amount of Catholic property destroyed in this country by open violence or midnight incendiaries, within comparatively few years. Yet we are not to look upon the coarse and illiterate creatures of the lower classes as the real criminals. We must, in truth, look to church-going people, from whom the impulse came. And here, again, the loss we sustain is not all. Those who give the impulse, and those who do the deed, alike have made a terrible step in disregarding the rights of property and of life. What they feel justified in doing to Catholics they will soon feel justified in doing to any one.

And the poor wretch who, hounded on by "No Popery" harangues, puts the torch to a Catholic church or convent, will be ready to apply it to the house or factory of any one whom he is led to regard as an oppressor of him or his class.

Those who lend their influence to deprive Catholics of the right of attending their own worship and receiving instruction from clergy of their own faith, have lost much of their respect for the rights of others, and will be ready to join in some other scheme for depriving men of those liberties for which our ancestors fought a century ago.

In this way this spirit has been a source of crime, begetting a disregard for the right of every man to his good name, his property, and his life. Lower the moral tone of a community in regard to one point, and you open the floodgate. There can be no doubt in any thinking mind that much of the moral decline in the whole nation is traceable to this source. It has falsified the conscience of our separated brethren to an incalculable extent. They never seem to consider at one glance the injury done us, and most assuredly never reflect for an instant on the terrible wrong which they are committing against their own moral nature and that of their children, whom they imbue from the cradle with such distorted moral ideas.

Our Catholic population contains a large proportion of the poorer classes: the rest of the poor are fast losing all religion. The State and public opinion seem alike determined to prevent any definite religious ideas obtaining among them. A kind of heathen morality is all that is permitted to be inculcated, which by its very



negation of every essential element of Christianity renders it powerless for good.

Our relation as Catholics to the condition of our poor, what is to be done to save what is still healthy, what is to be done to reclaim the lost, are subjects that must henceforth demand more general attention than they have hitherto received. Our difficulty will be all the greater as we shall find the power of the State and the influence of Protestant denominations constantly arrayed against us, and really aiding vice instead of encouraging us to suppress it. This is a hard thing to say, and yet every Catholic at all interested in the matter knows that there is no disguising the fact. For instance, in New Jersey, the Catholic boys and girls in the State Reform School are not allowed to be instructed in their religion, attend its worship, or receive its ordinances; they are forced to take part in Protestant worship and receive Protestant religious instruction. The Catholics established a reformatory of their own, but the State refuses to charter it, to confide Catholic children to it, or aid it at all in its good work. The State virtually says: "We are in the hands of proselytizers, and proselytize we shall as long as we can. We do not really care about reform, but so long as we can root Catholicity out of the hearts of these unfortunates, we are satisfied. This is one of the ends for which our government was established."

What exists in New Jersey exists elsewhere. In Massachusetts it was decided within the last year that the wife of a keeper of a poorhouse was a public officer by law, entitled to remain at the bedside of a dying Catholic and prevent her making her confession to a priest, and that the priest on attempting to exclude her from the room was a criminal, as liable to arrest and punishment as the drunken vagabond who knocks down a quiet citizen on the street.

In New York the forcing of Catholic boys to attend Protestant religious service led to a revolt, and though the Catholic Union used every effort to have the cause of discontent removed, the boys were punished and the inhuman bigots escaped even censure.

To consider now what Catholics have done and are doing, we find much to console as the work of a few, and much to give us pain as showing neglect on the part of our community in general. We do not see our wealthier and more influential men taking part in any movements to meet any of the wants which so strongly appeal to us as Catholics and as American citizens, and on the successful remedying of which the future well-being of our country depends. We see one of the great daily papers of the Union constantly giving advice to the Catholic hierarchy, clergy,

Religious Orders, secular and regular clergy, occasionally instructing the Sovereign Pontiff in regard to dogma and discipline; but though the proprietor is a millionaire, and at least nominally a Catholic, as his father was, we do not find that he has ever established any great Catholic charity, or been prominent in inaugurating any movement to help Catholic distress or save Catholics from moral and physical ruin. He is but one of a class. Yet we think that, by proper means, our leading citizens could be induced to take part in organizations similar to those for which our Protestant fellow-citizens find no difficulty in obtaining active co-operation. There is a certain timidity in our prominent men that seems almost moral cowardice, and the silence of Catholic members in municipal and educational boards, in legislative bodies, contrasts most unfavorably with the frank, free attitude of Catholic members in similar situations in England. Yet, if they felt that they were not in a manner isolated, we think that a more manly course would be adopted when they found that they were supported by numbers and respectability.

Certain it is that to meet the great moral wants, we must take action as a body. In the benevolent movements of the day, we cannot, as we have shown, take part, without in reality warring on our religion and convictions; and it is almost hopeless yet to expect our separated brethren to look at this question in the light of truth and honesty, or to stop the long-pursued course of tampering with the faith of Catholics. We can convert criminals much more readily.

In our desire to look well in the eyes of our fellow-men, we have been led away to erect churches that have been too costly. They are grand, and add dignity to religion, it is true, but the necessity of raising money to pay the absolutely necessary portion of the cost, and of meeting the annual interest on the mortgage debt, makes attendance at our churches a heavy tax on the poorer Catholics in many parts. A large expensive church holding but a comparatively small number is a great embarrassment to a zealous priest sent to such a parish. In our large cities there are many districts where hundreds of the faithful cannot, without great difficulty, assist at Mass or hear instructions. Yet, if we are to keep alive faith and religion in the hearts of the poor as the best guard against the temptations that surround them, we must have more and plainer churches for the poor, where the amount they can contribute will meet all the necessary expenses, if it is not possible to make them absolutely free. Here is a field for the generous Catholic who feels that he should make some return to God for the wealth lent to him, lent to him to traffic with till his Master comes. There are districts in every one of our large cities where a few

thousand dollars would secure and even endow a plain church that would afford hundreds of Catholics means of salvation. Let any one in New York start at the Battery, and proceed along the East River, and he will see the truth of this. He will go a mile in the lower part of the city before he reaches a Catholic Church, and then find one densely crowded, with schools attached, most creditable indeed, but both church and school requiring relief. And yet in this part of the city there are more Catholics than in some of our dioceses which have numbers of priests, churches, and institutions.

Cross the river to the great Catholic cemetery, and see what recalls the words of Job: "For now I should have been asleep and still, and should have rest in my sleep, with kings and consuls of the earth, who build themselves solitudes," for here, indeed, are solitudes worthy of kings, monuments simply of human pride costing thousands upon thousands of dollars. The thought can but come, how much nobler a monument a man might raise by erecting, at the cost of such a useless structure, a church in a poor densely populated neighborhood, where the Holy Sacrifice would be constantly offered for his soul, and the prayers of the poor, saved by it from the moral ruin that threatened themselves and their children, would rise day by day as a sweet incense to heaven.

To relieve our overcrowded churches and give the poor every means of practicing their religion and obtaining the encouragement and strength it can give, is the first step.

Providing for the Christian education of their children, we are undoubtedly doing to an extent that is simply wonderful. The number of our parochial schools in all parts of the country bears no mean ratio to those maintained by the State in the interest of the Protestant denominations, though, to some extent, at our expense.

But our poor are crowded in tenement houses, and they and their children are exposed to all the deleterious influences of those unhappy buildings. Places of entertainment for the more advanced, and play-grounds for the children, where all that is improper can be excluded, are necessities. Separate play-grounds for boys and girls, connected with the parochial schools, are a real want. The children of the tenement houses have no play-ground but the street, where they mix with the most vicious element. If ground could be obtained where they would be under good influence great evil would be avoided.

To afford the young men some place where they can enjoy innocent recreation, and thus be under no temptation to frequent the saloon, or the political hall, which is generally connected with a bar, is another want. Very successful attempts have been made in several places to supply this want. The present Bishop of

Rochester, when Rector of the Cathedral in Newark, established a Catholic Institute, in which there was a reading-room and a small library, a gymnasium, ball-alley, tables for innocent games, a room for public lectures and other conveniences. The amount of good effected was at once visible. Young men whose homes were crowded or confined, or who had but a small room in some boarding-house, here found recreation and congenial company, free from any temptation to intoxication or vicious indulgence.

The Church of the Assumption, in Brooklyn, has now, by the exertions of the Rev. William Keegan, a fine building of this character, with rooms for the meetings of the various societies connected with the church, bath-rooms, and rooms for practicing music; everything to attract the young, who justly feel proud of it and benefit by its advantages.

Among the first to recognize the advantages of such institutions are the city authorities, who soon note the influence they exert for the general well-being. In the occasional outbreaks of labor against capital, where many by the tyranny of unions, or by bad example, are led to violence, and after having been for years steady, respectable mechanics, find themselves denizens of a prison along with abandoned criminals, such institutions are a haven of salvation to the unemployed. They can scarcely be too much multiplied in our large cities, where the temptations are the greatest.

Besides the children who come to our parochial schools, there are many who are orphans and many whose parents are worse than dead—dead to God, religion, virtue. Our orphan asylums gather up many of the first class, instruct and fit them to obtain situations, and place them, fortified by good sound training, in positions to earn a decent living. Great as the numbers received in the asylums are, there are still many left unprovided, who join the class of those deprived of home by the vice of their parents, or who, learning vice, defy parental control.

"Vast numbers of these young creatures," said the New York Society for the Protection of Destitute Roman Catholic Children, in its first appeal, "vast numbers are daily wandering over the face of this great city, exposed to all the horrors of hopeless poverty, to the allurements of vice and crime, in every disgusting and debasing form, bringing ruin on themselves." "It is true we have our orphan asylums, our parochial schools, our Society of Saint Vincent de Paul, all of which are giving relief to the utmost extent of their capacity. Yet the amount of juvenile delinquency and wretchedness is hardly diminished; the full tide of destitution and destruction still flows on, and seems likely soon to be swollen by a new current." "We can certainly do something to arrest it. As Catholics, we have the motive; as men, we have the means."

Though their protectory now contains two thousand three hundred children, the appeal is still true as an utterance of the present day.

Voluntary refuges were needed. The Rev. G. T. Haskins established his House of the Angel Guardian in Boston, and similar establishments have been organized in various parts. But the number is too small and the tendency is, perhaps—whether wisely or unwisely—to create very large central establishments, rather than more numerous local institutions. In 1872 the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul established a home for boys in New York, which, under the Rev. John C. Drumgoole, has been very successful. Brooklyn has a similar one, under the Rev. Mr. Hickey. The aid furnished such an institution is a solid investment, certain of producing a large return. After years of experience this clergyman says: "No class of children can be more readily brought under the influence of our holy religion than the homeless and destitute children. They have their faults, but they cannot be blamed, for these faults are to be attributed to the pernicious example of parents, who being a disgrace to religion themselves, by the lives they lead, deprive their children of all means of bettering their condition, either spiritually or temporally. The remark has been made more than once that these poor children cannot be reclaimed because they inherit the bad qualities of their parents. This, from experience, I most positively deny, and do so on the authority of these little fellows themselves, who, with tears in their eyes, deplore the low and vicious habits of their degraded parents."

The establishment of reformatories and homes is a matter of necessity, and as Catholics we must make sacrifices to save these young people, for neither as Catholics nor as Americans can we allow them to go to destruction and become a scourge to the country.

While the sectarian associations work on the principle of breaking all family ties, our Catholic institutions try to strengthen them, and the reclaimed boy, though often persecuted by degraded parents, is sometimes the instrument of their reform.

The Sisters of Mercy, as one great object of their institution, have refuges for girls whose virtue is endangered, and in their institutions in various parts of the country have done incalculable good; but as a community we seem to do little to aid them in their saving work. In their visits to prisons they afford Catholics fallen into crime means of amending their lives and certainly produce good results; although it has to be admitted that many of the convicts become incorrigibly wedded to a life of dishonesty. It is a startling and terrible statement of a clergyman long connected with the Albany Penitentiary, that while men are often reclaimed by re-

viving their religious faith and its influence, it is almost impossible to make any impression on the hearts of women who have become criminals.

For those who have been led astray, but have not committed crimes punishable by State law, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd make it their peculiar field to labor. Religion here appeals in all its force, and reformation is effected with a solid basis, giving every hope of a future virtuous life. To those who feel that the world presents too many dangers, a permanent home under a religious rule is offered, and they are enabled to support themselves by their industry, free from all danger.

Foundling asylums, too, afford to many unmarried mothers shelter and encouragement to reformation.

For the aged poor the Little Sisters of the Poor have asylums as their sole and special object; and Sisters of Charity and other Communities make it in various places one of the objects of their care.

Our Catholic institutions, not always sufficiently attracting the interest and encouragement of our Catholic people at large, are thus constantly meeting many of the crying wants of our time. But the tenement houses as hotbeds of sin and misery remain almost untouched. The visits of Priest, of Sisters of Charity and of Mercy to the sick are not enough. Those of the members of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul can do little to palliate the general evil or make a very permanent impression. The movement begun in some cities to seek legislative action to limit the number of tenants in one building, has thus far dealt more in rhetoric and fine phrases than in anything having any appearance of a system of providing better homes for the poorer classes. These must live, and they prefer life in a city, where they can obtain employment, to life in the country. Mere encouragement to go West, breaking asunder family ties by separating husband and wife, or parents and children, is not a step that can be ultimately beneficial. The country is wide enough and varied enough to afford means of livelihood for all; but many of the poor are unskilled and ignorant of means of support. There seems to be an opening for some Religious Order, like the Benedictine or Franciscan, to begin as they did in Germany or California, making a monastic establishment, with its church and school, as a centre, and selling lands around to poor families drawn from the cities, who can be aided and guided till they are self-supporting, thus building up a Catholic settlement and giving employment to mechanics as well as agriculturists. In the colonization schemes that are from time to time inaugurated, none have looked especially or mainly to the salvation of the inhabitants of our overcrowded city tenement houses, yet there would seem to

be no insurmountable difficulty in obtaining land enough to make the attempt, and to obtain such legislative sanction as would, to a great extent, keep intemperance from destroying the good work. The Methodists at Ocean Grove and Asbury Park, New Jersey, have thus prevented all sale of liquor, and insured in those settlements freedom from intoxication and the evils that follow in its train.

Some of the Southern States offer land as cheap and healthier than the West, where market-gardening for the North is highly remunerative, and smaller farms could be made to give support.

But we Catholics cannot remain in apathy. The increase of crime and of the criminal classes is such as to excite universal alarm, and despite all that has been done and is doing its increase is more rapid than our present means of checking it. Where in our city parishes zealous Religious come to give a mission or retreat, hundreds come to the confessional and make their peace with God, who, living within sound of the church bell, have been strangers for many years to all that religion can give; but though the conversion is sincere, they go back to the same temptations, the same allurements, and the newly acquired habit of virtue is too weak, the path of duty is too difficult, there is no hand to encourage in the moment of weakness, and they fall back.

Thousands can be saved if we can give them healthier surroundings.

The communistic organizations, ramifying throughout the country, will involve many and will bring untold woe on all. The Molly Maguire murders, in Pennsylvania, show that ignorant Catholics can be led into such organizations, and they undoubtedly will, there and elsewhere. Religion alone can save them, and it has to be brought home to them till they feel its influence. In those mining districts many have expiated on the gallows crimes of which they were the reluctant instruments. There are others as weak, who, if withdrawn from evil association there, might elsewhere become useful members of society.

To help the poor in our great cities, whose numbers and whose dangers are increasing, and to save their children is one point that needs concerted action on the part of Catholics generally. Whether by special associations or otherwise, we must give them more churches, facilitate removal to healthier spots, and secure means of livelihood.

The scattered Catholics in the rural districts are exposed to dangers of their own, dangers more especially of a gradual dying out of the faith. They should be aided to concentrate. Both feel the constant war on their faith and need popular cheap books to meet the objections to Catholics and their religion, or to religion of any kind. These should be clear, bright, pointed, and

less defensive than aggressive. The assailants are generally deplorably ignorant and can be easily met. They try to make the Catholic ashamed of his religion, and undoubtedly many are lost to us, who, looking rather to the opinion of men than of God, are ridiculed out of their faith. We should give these help, and strengthen their faith, and enable them to turn the shafts of ridicule on the incongruities, absurdities, and real irreligion of their persecutors.

Our catechetical books, written in other countries, are generally antiquated and defective in form. We need treatises better adapted to our needs to save our young people, and to save them, to keep religion in their hearts is the greatest service we can render our country.

Nor is it among the poorer only that this is the fact. The graduates of our colleges meet in the circles where they move the same temptations, and if they lose the faith, they too are fair candidates for the criminal classes. Our colleges certainly have not produced in the country generally the results we might naturally expect. The graduates have not made their influence felt as have those of the rationalistic institutions, and, in spite of the training they have received, not a few seem to be moral cowards enough to be laughed out of their faith, or at least out of the practice of their religion. We do not find the robust, sturdy, stalwart faith, which, kindled by the enthusiasm of youth, should exert a wide influence and cheer those lower in life, who seeing courage, take heart in turn.

A great Catholic University is a want, but it will require years of preparation to give it a faculty that will meet every branch of science and learning as acknowledged masters, and take issue at once with all the erroneous theories of the day so ably that the students will feel that they are on the victorious side. But whether by associations, publications, or a more general shaping of education to meet our wants, we must strengthen the faith of the poor, and rouse the faith of the rich, choked by the cares and pleasures of this world, or the rapid increase of the criminal element will rob us of our poor and leave our wealthier enervated and helpless.

The great peril of this country approaches, and to us Catholics comes with terrible meaning the question: "Why stand ye here all the day idle?"

Not only must we have more and plainer churches, with ragged schools, if you like, societies to aid the tenement-house poor in obtaining a livelihood in country parts, more extended associations to support reformatories and refuges, but we need higher educational establishments, a great Catholic University that will give us what we lack, a class of thoroughly educated and truly Catholic young men, who will inspire Catholic life in the upper class and by ex-



ample and influence act on the lower class. Unless the Catholics more favored by fortune do not show more of Christian life, and exert a wider and more general influence than they have yet done, they will be swept away in the general irreligion around them, and so far from preserving or reclaiming their poorer brethren, will have to be brought to higher and better thoughts by the examples furnished among their humbler brethren.

On them rests a grave and a great responsibility.

They are called upon by every motive to give time, influence, and exertion to avert the evils which menace us.

---

### ADMISSIONS OF OUR ADVERSARIES.

"Judicibus vel inimicis nostris."

THE testimony of an unwilling witness, in a civil or criminal court, has deservedly very great weight, and preponderates largely over the evidence of one who has no bias, and still more over the words of those whose eagerness to testify is apparent. This is especially visible in matters pertaining to the doctrine and practice of the Church; for there is frequently manifested among thinkers of the "advanced type," a certain disposition to sneer at even the best and most thoroughly presented arguments of a professed champion in her cause, chiefly through the insinuation that *by this craft he has his livelihood*; and that therefore, whether he really thinks so or not, he is necessarily bound down to present as strong a case as possible, and to smooth over, with his utmost adroitness, the real difficulties of the question. This we well remember to have been the case among very many with whom we were acquainted in early days, who used frequently to assert that "the learned of the clergy of the Romish Church knew better than to believe her doctrines;" but that they merely kept up appearances, making the worse appear the better cause and using their ability simply for personal ends. From this it was easily deducible, and on that conclusion they acted, that they would not read the arguments of Catholic writers, nor would they give heed to the most logical reasoning of well-informed Catholics; and thus it became utterly impossible to bring them to a respectful consideration of the claims which the Church has, particularly upon every bap-

tized Christian, as also upon the whole human race, in regard to their conversion, for which she has her divine mission. Surely this was simply placing themselves beyond the ordinary possibility of salvation, since "*faith cometh by hearing.*" Indeed we know no more striking admission on the part of our adversaries than the tacit one manifested in their craven fear of a well-informed Catholic, and their utter horror of a well-written Catholic work.

We have, therefore, thought it not unlikely that were we to present a few distinctive points of *doctrine* and *practice* in the Catholic Church, merely prefacing them by some introductory remarks and adding a few candid admissions of the more respectable and learned of our opponents, touching the truth of the *doctrinal assertions* and the manifest utility and benefit of the *practical* portion, we might interest some of our readers to make still further collection of evident admissions from our foes, and perhaps open a way for some who grope after truth, since, as above indicated, there are many outside the pale of the Church who would esteem such testimony least liable to be impugned; and thus, by God's grace, they may be brought to the rock-built edifice with which our Saviour has promised to be "*all days.*" Nor is our article aggressive, save in so far as the statements and admissions of Protestants and infidels in favor of the Church of God may deserve that epithet, certainly the aggression comes not from us. True, the Church stands in no need of testimony *ab extra*. Her foundation is sure, being God's promise, which cannot fail; but we have merely jotted down instances which occur *hic et nunc* where Balaam has been forced to bless Israel instead of cursing him, showing how the Almighty makes the wrath of man redound to His praise. Our aim shall have been fully attained, if this faint tracing out of a few of the admissions of the enemies of the Church should induce others to continue the work further and more accurately than duties enable us to do. For we may rest assured that there are many, very many, who may be reached and who can be influenced by arguments presented and coming from such a source, who would not enter a Catholic Church, listen to a Catholic lecture, or pay the slightest attention to the reasoning of the ablest Catholic logician in the world, but who will respond at once to the call of their fellow-religionists, or *non-religionists*, as the case may be. All that we desire is, that they would hearken: for truth will certainly make its way and conquer error, except in the case of the utterly reprobate, but in order to be known, it must first be heard.

It has frequently struck us as quite possible to take up the various admissions of the most reputable among our adversaries, and thence efform an entire system of Catholic theology. We should have to traverse the whole controverted territory of the

creed, since, though article by article, each, in its turn, is by some unhesitatingly admitted, yet by others it is just as earnestly repudiated. The general deduction which we thence make is, that they have always vacillated, and that, *save dislike to the Church*, they have not now, nor have they ever had, any definitely fixed creed. There remains the singular fact that were we to take all the different sects (God's Church is *no sect*), from the earliest ages to the present day: Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, etc., down to the last fungus growth from the latest putrefaction of Calvinism, Arminianism, Socinianism, Quakerism, or Unitarianism, and to question them, point by point, on the Catholic creed, the absolute majority, *among themselves*, would admit the teaching of the Church. This fact, which will bear the most rigid investigation, made a deep impression on that eloquent orator and profound thinker, Edmund Burke, when put before him by a number of his countrymen, who implored him to help them from the yoke of the galling "Penal Laws." "Take," said they, "this hypothesis: Let all professing themselves Christians (save and except the Catholic Church) unite together in council; or let adequate representatives of every sect under the title of Christian, from the beginning of Christianity, be called together and questioned concerning their views or faith, taking up each and every article of the Catholic creed for discussion and decision; the majority of that council would invariably be given for the Catholic faith." Hence, they concluded, "Catholics deserve honest and fair treatment at the hands of every nation regarding itself as Christian."

We might call the attention of the thinker to the semi-occasional convulsive strivings among Protestants after an unattainable unity, exemplified in their Evangelical Alliances, World's Conventions, Pan-Anglican Synods, etc.; since by striving thereafter, even though gropingly and wrongly, they yet thereby admit the *desirableness*, if not the *necessity*, of that unity which is only attainable in the Church of God. Indeed, in returning to the Common Mother, they would hardly have more concessions, than they are obliged to make amid the general divergences of an Evangelical Alliance; nor are they totally unaware of the anomaly of their position, claiming to be followers of Christ, yet radically and permanently divided in doctrine and practice; some of them not even admitting the axiom, "*verum nequaquam quod variat*."

Of course we speak to and for those who believe in God's word, those whose inmost conviction is that our Saviour meant what He said; and not either for utter infidelity or for those who, professing nominally to believe Holy Scripture, merely accept so much of it as suits them *pro hac vice*. We leave out, therefore, the first Anglicans, Book of Homilies, p. ii. "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned,

all sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom (an horrible and dreadful thing to think on), have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested by God and damnable to men, the space of 800 years and more." What shall we say of such doctrine or of the believers therein? When we consider the promise of Christ, to be with his Church "*all days*." What can the utterers of such sentiments have thought, or their followers now think? Are the plainest words of Holy Writ of any avail, when opposed to their prejudices or preconceived views? Absit blasphemia! But they might as well call the Ruler of the Universe a liar! Arguments, analogy, admissions, from friend or foe, would all be wasted on such beings; nor do we address ourselves to any such. The utter Atheist (did the monster exist), the honest and avowed Infidel, the Mohammedan, or Pagan, might be reached by the truth, but these are, humanly speaking, hopeless.

Still there exists a large number, of all grades of intellect, of all stations in society, and of various degrees of educational culture, who, if they knew the truth, if they could be brought fairly face to face with it, would acknowledge it; but whose surroundings through life hitherto have been of that kind that they have never had the opportunity, and who now, as adults, pass through life, some of them prejudiced against the Church, more of them apathetic towards her, and all of them with an ill-defined general idea that Catholics are vulgar, poor, mostly foreigners, and always superstitious; consequently, that the evidences of their religion are not worth investigating. For these the few hints in this article are thrown out, that finding, on the admission of some of the modern leaders of thought, firm ground existing where they fancied nothing but marsh, they may be induced to drain off some of their former prejudices, and reclaim ground whereon, by the help of God, to build a future edifice of faith. We produce to these the testimony, isolated, it is true, and bearing in each instance on a single point, of profound writers, whose training has rendered them unable to grasp the system of the Church in its entirety. For Almighty God has so arranged, that even our ablest and bitterest opponents have had, at times, lucid intervals of surcease of mental fog, during which they have made admissions entirely suicidal to the various and variegated "schemes of salvation" which spring from Protestantism.

It may be taken for granted that the Church propounds no doctrines for the belief of her members which seem to Protestants, etc., so absurd and incomprehensible as *infallibility and transubstantiation*. If, then, it be found that there are learned and ingenuous Protestants who admit the necessity of the one, and the consonance with Scripture of the other, we may readily imagine that, on other

and less salient points, still larger and more frequent admissions may be expected. We take an instance of each. "In every form of Christianity there *must exist an infallibility* somewhere."—(HUGH MILLER, *First Impressions*, ch. xiii.)

"No doctrine can be more *rigorously defended* both by *Scripture* and by *tradition* than that of *transubstantiation*, but, its consequences proving disastrous to society, it has been found convenient to repudiate it, with *bad reasoning*, but with excellent results."—(*Westminster Review*, art. "Quakerism.")

The latter writer does not condescend to give us anything beyond his own assertion for the *disastrous results* of the doctrine upon society, nor do we propose to set him right in the premises. That with which we have to do is the downright square admission of the truth of the doctrine of the Church in both instances given, and the daily reading of even the most cursory and superficial peruser of the literature of the day fairly bristles with similar grounding of arms on the part of our antagonists. For example, there is nowadays no cry so popular, no motto so distinctive, no howl which so speedily traverses the domain of Protestantism as that of "*the Bible, the Bible only!*" Yet we find two of their most distinguished professors speaking thus:

"Long since it was foretold that we (*Protestants*) should yet be forced to admit the utter insufficiency of individual interpretation of Scripture." The prediction is now fulfilled, since it is Protestantism itself that writes as follows: "Why did we replace a living authority by a dead letter, if we must study the languages of the dead past to understand the Scriptures? The burden is beyond all reason!"—(DR. VON SCHELLING, *Vorlesungen über die akademischen Studien*.)

"The Protestant Church, taking Scripture alone as doctrinal base, is founded on the sand."—(DR. DELBRUCK, *Phil. Melancthon, der Glaubenslehrer*.)

So much being premised, and with the full understanding that our article can at the utmost but shadow out a portion of the coast to be triangulated, since to lay down full charts would require a series of articles in the first place, and the said coast of error being exposed to the full swell of the ocean of truth, in which the tides are high and tidal waves not infrequent, we leave the remainder of the work of survey and sounding to hands and minds less preoccupied. And now for the admissions: first in points of doctrine, which we shall take in this order, viz.:

1. Need of unity of faith, and hence of practice.
2. Necessity of confession and its accord with Scripture.
3. Propriety of prayers for the dead and proofs of their antiquity.
4. Invocation of Saints and its consonance with our wants.

We, as Catholics, know nothing better suited to give manifest proof of the need of unity than the prayer of our Divine Lord in the memorable texts of St. John's Gospel, xvii. 20, 21: "And not

for them only do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in me: that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." It would hardly be possible for ingenuity to change the obvious sense of these words, and the deduction from such visible unity is clearly made: "That they may believe that Thou hast sent me." If to this be added the plain fact here implied and elsewhere announced by our Redeemer, that His work was to continue always, even to the end of time, it will not be difficult to see how imperative are the claims of unity upon Christians. True, this and similar texts of Scripture only have weight with those who admit that Christ, our Lord, came upon earth to found His Church, and actually performed the work; and we write only for such as will admit, at least, so much of divine revelation. Those who do not admit this, and who do not believe either the words or works of Christ, are very little likely to be moved by the admissions of the ablest opponents of Catholicity.

But let us represent to ourselves a reasoning man, who accepts, indeed, the Scriptures, and who has, with great labor, managed to shape out for himself a creed or system of belief from the fragments of revelation within his comprehension. We do not say that such a person exists or ever existed, but, *on Protestant principles, he should exist*; such being the only logical way, according to the doctrines of the *reformers*, in which the individual should attain a knowledge of the way of salvation! But our dissenting brethren, while they deny the principle of authority, and generally contemptuously repudiate infallibility, and while they are absolutely without either unity or certainty in matters of faith, still act practically as though each sect, or fragment thereof, were under infallible guidance, and mainly take for granted that the Almighty is with the sect in which each individual happened to be born, making thus a clear admission of the need of guidance in order to attain a knowledge of the truth. Our supposititious friend then takes his system to be *probable*, on the purely Protestant grounds of research and private opinion. The merely probable has been attained, but he can possess no certitude, save what springs from and is based on his own vain and empty imaginings. Nevertheless, we must suppose that he has been earnestly struggling all along after the truth, unutterably desirous of a knowledge of the doctrine of Christ (which must be *one*) and for infallible certainty. Yet neither he nor his companions, having excogitated a *society*, and calling themselves perchance by the name of "*Church*," will venture the presumption of a claim to infallibility. The very fact that not one of the numerous *soi-disant* "*churches*" has ever straightforwardly

made such a claim (they all do so *by implication*), is not only a broad admission, but a positive proof that none of them possesses it. And this may in some degree explain the fact that with one consent they pour out the vials of their wrath against the Catholic Church, which has always claimed, as logically she must, exclusive possession of this divine prerogative. How, indeed, should a merely human association lay claim to a gift so manifestly divine? The default of claim manifests the lack of title.

Such, and thus instituted, are all the sects; and yet admitting, as they must, that they have no unity, avowing readily their want of absolute certainty, and venturing no claim, logical or otherwise, to be considered exclusively as "*the Church*," they yet presume to put forth formulas, which must be sworn to, and articles innumerable, which must be subscribed and obeyed by all their members. Why do they not come boldly from behind their purely negational and protesting phraseology, saying in words what they all say in deed, viz.: "God has obliged all men to accept the doctrine of our society, but He has by no means promised or pledged himself in any way that our teaching is true! On the contrary, both it and we *may be* entirely wrong; *probably are so*, for we claim no infallibility, and the vast mass of Christendom (to which we are but as a drop in the bucket) is entirely against us." That this is no vagary of the imagination we need only call attention to the various books of Common Prayer, Confessions of Faith, Articles of Belief, Catechisms, Forms of Church Government, and Directories for Worship, all of them differing, and yet to these, despite their want of unity, harmony, or even the slightest meagre certainty that they will remain unchanged for any consecutive three months, every one must subscribe, who joins an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregational, or even a Methodist meeting, thus having his creed fixed upon him, since "in every form of sect there must exist an infallibility somewhere," even though confessedly contradictory.

This admission of lack of unity and want of infallible authority is peculiarly strange and painful, to minds reverting, however briefly, to the splendid certainty of Israel before the coming of the Messiah, now through the promises made to the Patriarchs, now through God-sent men, who spoke without the shadow of doubt, saying, "*Thus saith the Lord*," as Moses, Joshua, and the Judges; anon through the long series of Prophets during the whole of Old Testament times. The Divine presence, moreover, on the mercy seat, the Ephod of the High Priest, transmitting an unquestionable certainty to the inquirer; and the daily sacrifices, manifesting unity of worship, force the candid mind to admit the superiority of Jewish over Protestant times. In short, so far from being obliged thereby to thankfulness for the great goodness of God in redemp-

tion, on Protestant principles, it were far better that our Saviour had not yet come! Nor is there the remotest doubt but that the subdivided condition of disintegrating sects has largely hindered the conversion of Jews and Pagans. Surely, when so much, and that, too, on so grand a scale, was done for the Jews, a fair analogy would lead us to expect that the coming of the Messiah should at least leave Christians no worse off than people were under the old dispensation. Only in the Catholic Church is this completely accomplished, where perfection answers promise, where the sacrifice responds to the type, where the line of priestly succession has its accomplishment, and the real presence of God in the ancient Holy of Holies, is made still more unspeakably tender by the presence of Christ in the sacrifice of His love for man!

To discuss, however, the want of unity of the sects in the broad light of their patent contradictions of each other and of themselves on almost every doctrinal point, becomes still more superfluous in view of their own admissions. Thus, not to say anything of the earlier heresiarchs and writers of the Reformation, who openly contradicted and defied each other, we have the general assertion of the learned Anglican *Bishop of Lincoln* in a charge to his clergy, as follows:

"Our articles and liturgy do not correspond with the sentiments of any of the eminent reformers on the continent, or with the creeds of any of the Protestant churches which are there established."

Whilst *Dudith* in his epistle to Beza, confessed, that

"If that be true which the ancient Fathers professed, then the truth is wholly on the side of the Catholics."

No wonder that *Bishop Horne* expresses the want of unity among them thus strongly:

"The church (*Protestant*) is an indigested mass of contrarieties jumbled together—  
..... a mere chaos."

Of course, under such circumstances, those who are logical, following their own inner light, find themselves in the end Rationalists; whilst a large number, seeing no hope of unity in diversity, return to obey the voice of authority in the bosom of the Church of God. Time would fail us to mention names of those illustrious from station, eminent through ability, and still more distinguished through the graces conferred on them by Almighty God, who have within the past fifty years, both in this country and in Europe, given in the weight of their admissions in favor of God's Truth, from all the varied sects, by casting their lot with the Catholic Church and giving their adhesion to her; and if the duty be not too painful for our adversaries, we would very gently, but with great confidence, ask a comparison of their virtues, holy purposes,



and well-known sacrifices with the motives of those who may have, either lately or at any past time, fallen from the Catholic Church, even though but for a time. Such comparison will assuredly furnish food for thought—neither will the cause of the Church lose thereby!

That Christ our Lord came to save sinners is a truth which all who have the slightest tincture of Christianity unhesitatingly admit, whilst His own assertion that as Son of man He had "power on earth to forgive sins," joined with His actual performance of a visible miracle over sickness to prove His invisible authority over sin (St. Matth. ix., St. Mark ii., St. Luke v.), leave no doubt as to the fact that such forgiveness is within the ambit of His perpetual mission. The promise given by Him to his Disciples covered the whole ground, and the fulfilment of that promise: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye shall remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx.), leaves nothing to be desired as to its meaning, especially when the practice of the Church and the sense of the earliest and best writers are consulted. The exceeding happiness of having made a good confession is beyond the power of words to describe; and those alone even partially appreciate their blessed condition who, as Catholics, are deeply penetrated with a sense that the power and authority there called into use are entirely divine. It is thus, and thus only, that we dare approach the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, having on the wedding-garment, and having proved ourselves capable of satisfying the Apostolic precept, "to discern the body of the Lord." Listen, however, to the admissions of learned and subtle adversaries on this score:

"The institution of sacramental confession is assuredly worthy of the divine wisdom, and, of all the doctrines of religion, it is the most admirable and the most beautiful. The necessity of confessing sin is sufficient to preserve from it those who still preserve their modesty; and yet, if any fail, confession consoles and restores them. I look on a grave and prudent confessor as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls. His counsels regulate the sentiments, reprove vices, remove the occasions of sin, cause the restitution of ill-acquired property and the reparation of wrongs, clear up doubts, console under afflictions, in fine, cure or relieve all the evils of the soul: and as nothing in the world is more precious than a faithful friend, what is the value of that friend, when he is bound by his functions and fitted by his knowledge to devote to you all his care, under the seal of an inviolable secrecy!"—(LEIBNITZ, *Syst. Theol.*)

"The enemies of the Roman Church who have assailed the salutary institution of confession, appear to have removed the strongest restraints which can be put upon secret crimes. Even the sages of antiquity have felt the importance of it."—(*Annales de l'Empire.*)

"Confession is an excellent institution—a curb to crime, and formed to induce to forgiveness hearts ulcerated by hatred."—(*Quest. Encycloped.*)

"What reparations and restitutions does not confession produce among Catholics!"—(ROUSSEAU, *Emile.*)

"Private confession is of very ancient practice in the Church, and of excellent use and benefit."—(BP. MONTAGUE'S *Appeal.*)

"I am happy, General, that I have fulfilled my duties. I wish you, at your death, the same happiness. I had need of it."—(EMP. NAPOLEON BONAP.)

"There is no doubt that confession is necessary and established by God; but secret and auricular confession, as practiced at this day, in the Church, especially pleases me. It is not merely useful, it is necessary. God forbid that I should wish its abolition! I rejoice that it exists in the Church, because it is the only means to restore peace to troubled consciences."—(LUTHER apud *Ussleber*.)

"Who has not turned a longing eye to the tribunal of penance? Who has not yearned, in the bitterness of remorse and in uncertainty as to the Divine forgiveness, to hear the lips that can say to him with the power of Christ: 'Go in peace; thy sins are forgiven thee?' For myself, if I believed that I had found that supernatural power, which the Church attributes to herself; that power, the precious and unfailing source of reconciliations, restitutions, effectual repentance; of all that God most loves after innocence, standing again by the dying bed of him, whom in the cradle it had blessed, and amid the most pathetic exhortations and the most tender farewells, saying: 'Depart, Christian soul;' if I believed that I had found such a power upon earth, there are often moments, when I would joyfully lay down at its feet that liberty of conscience, which, at times, presents itself much more as a burden than as a privilege!"—(NEVILLE of *Geneva*.)

"Here shall the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it; after this manner, etc."—(*Anglican Visitation of the Sick*.)

Dr. Pusey and his followers, despite the efforts of most of the prelates of the Anglican Establishment, have advanced so far, that confession is practiced amongst them quite generally in England; and even in this country, it is, as we are credibly informed, far from being unknown among those Episcopalians who are known by the names of High Churchmen or Ritualists! See their missions, preparations for confession, and holy communion, etc.

We come now to the admissions of our dissenting brethren concerning the consoling and touching practice of prayers for the dead, based as are all Catholic practices upon the doctrine of the Church. Assuredly, were there no place of purgatory, there could be no prayers for the dead; since those who are already in heaven do not need, and those upon whom final judgment has been passed, can receive no advantage from our prayers. Certainly, the fact that Israel, in every age, offers prayers, both public and private, for the repose of the dead, has deservedly had great weight with men of thought; and such as are at all versed in history, cannot but admit the fact related in the Book of the Macchabees as historical testimony, where the practice is laid down, with the simple but plain reason added, that "*it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.*" The same fact is daily attested by the ritual of the synagogue and the prayers used by the Rabbis and people for the repose of the departed. The reasonableness of this practice and of the doctrine on which it is based, to say nothing of the authority presented by its antiquity and continuity, is thus admitted by the learned lexicographer, Dr.

Samuel Johnson, who says: "The generality of mankind are neither so obstinately wicked as to deserve everlasting punishment, nor so good as to deserve being admitted into the society of the blessed spirits; and therefore, God is graciously pleased to allow a middle state, where they may be purified by certain degrees of sufferings. You see, there is nothing unreasonable in this." (*Boswell's Life*.) His practice seems to have been consonant with his belief, since it is well authenticated that he prayed regularly for his deceased parents and for his wife. Indeed, what are the numerous current expressions which we read in Protestant literature and hear in daily life: "*May the earth rest lightly upon his remains*;" "*may the sod lie gently upon his bosom*," etc., but the expression of a natural and instinctive longing felt by all to pray for their dead friends and acquaintances?

"The ancient Fathers speak often of prayers for the dead, and we do not forbid them."—(MELANCTHON, *Apology for the Augs. Conf.*)

That learned Protestant Prelate, DR. FORBES, in his discourse on Purgatory, says: "Let not the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the Universal Church of Christ, almost from the very time of the Apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive Church, and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages. The Church Universal has believed the practice not only to be lawful, but likewise beneficial to the souls departed. Let it be granted that this custom was always judged lawful and also profitable by pious antiquity, and most generally received at all times in the Church."

"The universal and apparently apostolical custom of praying for the dead in Christ, is admitted. Further, that the prayers of the living benefit the dead in Christ, is, to say the least, not inconsistent, as USHER shows us, with the primitive belief."—(*Oxford Tracts*, 79.)

Quite lately we were amused by the very ponderousness of an article in the *British Quarterly Review*, where, under the head of "*Contemporary Literature*," the object would seem to be the proof, that "there is an antecedent probability for the existence of a higher order of beings than man;" and the author, under review (*M. Godet, Biblical Studies*), is highly praised as one born in a spot not "stunted by the breath of Roman superstition." The expression, intended to be insulting, is a patent admission of the higher plane on which Catholics move and have their being, and is an unintentional, an unwilling compliment to the Church of God! Wherever such phrases occur, the reader may quite securely prepare himself for weak reasoning; and this was truly a case in point, in which by dint of cogent argument darkness was made eminently visible. It is true, the inference was mainly from analogy, but the labor bestowed was entirely too great for the result dimly and faintly attained by this process, when the fact is so patent from Holy Writ! Of course, for so enlightened a philosopher, the authority of the Church would avail naught! How can the Old or New Testaments

be clearer than they are concerning the existence of spirits, which become specifically *angels*, or *messengers*, when sent upon particular duties? The fact that they are thus occupied, is abundantly apparent throughout the Scriptures; and that they are interested in our well-being, capable of praying for, and of protecting us; that their prayers are offered to the Most High for us, and that the prayers of the Saints ascend through angelic intervention, can be pointed out in the plainest words of inspiration. If we examine the Jewish Liturgies, we shall find regular invocations directed to the Holy Angels, in keeping with the blessing of the dying Patriarch: "May the Angel, who guided me, and kept me from all evil, bless the youth." (*Genesis* xlviii.) The synagogue has always had recourse to the intercession of those of the dead, whom it regarded as saints, and asks the same aid of prayers from angels. (*Harmony of Church*.)

"When it is said that the saints cannot hear our prayers, unless God reveal them to them, so that Almighty God, upon the Roman theory, conveys from us to them those requests which they are to ask back again of Him for us, we are certainly using an unreal, because an unscriptural argument. Moses on the mount, having the sin of his people first revealed to him by God, that he, in turn, might intercede with God for them. Indeed it is through Him (in whom we live, move, and have our being), that we are able in this life, to hear the requests of each other, and to present them to Him in prayer. Such an argument then, while shocking and profane to the ears of a Romanist, is shallow even in the judgment of a philosopher."—(*Oxford Tracts*, 71.)

"We cannot bear too reverent a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not the worship which is due unto God himself. Let us keep the language of the primitive Church: 'Let her be honored and esteemed; let Him be worshipped and adored.'"—(Bp. PEARSON, *On the Creed*.)

It will thus be seen that the Church is not without testimony to the truth of her doctrines even from her foes; and it will with equal readiness be perceived that we have only, from the nature of the case, adduced a very few of the admissions under each head; selecting from the vast mass such as seemed most striking, or such as we could most readily lay our hands upon; neither have we gone beyond the record, carefully confining ourselves to such admissions as bore pointedly upon the doctrines intended for presentation in this article.

Having thus cursorily presented a few points of doctrine in regard to the truth of which, some at least of our opponents do not disagree with us, we come next to *matters of practice* among Catholics; in regard to which we shall have to be even more brief than had been at first intended. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says the Apostle, and as practice is a necessary result of doctrine, our sincerity in our belief and the advantages and purity of that belief itself, are best tested by the practices resultant therefrom. But it is so obviously impossible to give, word for word,

quotation for each point, that in this branch of the subject we shall content ourselves with merely indicating generally what the admissions are, and occasionally whence they emanate. Our friends of the opposite side are scant of creed to be sure, and what there is of it is not very fixed; by consequence their round of religious practices is limited; and if a somewhat overstrained outward observance of what they are pleased to term the "*Sabbath*"—a tendency on the part of the more religiously inclined among them to sleep longer on the morning of that day, and to go decorously to hear a "*discourse*"—be taken away, there remains but little in the way of religious practice among Protestants at large. Ah! we forget. There is an annual "*Thanksgiving*," very well observed as a holiday; and we seem to remember sporadic "*Fast-days*," so-called, perhaps, because nobody fasted thereon. Condensing, therefore, as much as in us lies, what remains shall be said in regard to the following heads:

1. The daily opening and the daily service in the Catholic Churches.
2. Charitable institutions, their permanence and dignity in the Church.
3. Religious Orders, and the work accomplished by them.
4. The Priest at the death-bed, and the value of his attendance.
5. Catholic patriotism and loyalty.

It is a frequent subject of remark by Protestants in the United States, and a still more oft-recurring observation of tourists and writers of travel in Europe, that whereas the Protestant and other non-Catholic places of worship are invariably closed, except for a few hours on Sunday, the Catholic churches are on the other hand daily open for adorers, rarely untenanted by them, and that divine service (when there is a priest), is intermitted on no day of the year. In short the "*Meeting-house*" is true to its name and origin, *i. e.*, a place for coming together, not for worship, but to see and be seen, and to hear during half an hour, a display of eloquence on some abstract or current topic, an address to the people under the thin veneer of a prayer to God, or a popular explication of how the book of Genesis may be made to agree with Darwin; or, the Apostle Paul to harmonize with Huxley. Yet in this our dissenting brethren are entirely consistent with themselves; since, as they do not contend that any special benediction rests on the place, it would be difficult to understand why any special reverence for it should be implied. It is merely its size and capacity for accommodating numbers, that render it in any respect different from a private parlor or dining-room.

When the divinely instituted Jewish religion had its Temple, it was recognized as the "*House of God*," and the regard and rever-

ence paid to it was because of the real and actual presence of the Almighty therein. Even now the Synagogue has its "*sacred place*," towards which, in imitation of temple rites, our Hebrew friend humbly bows with the veneration due to the Law of the Most High; and on the Day of the Atonement, the people humbly prostrate themselves with their Rabbi before the casket, whence the spirit has fled.

Pass then into a Catholic church. All sign themselves with the sign of the cross, all make a devout bending of the knee, all eyes turn to the altar, each is absorbed in "that ark of worship undefiled;" and the poor (who have chiefly built the edifice), are not only welcome but they know and recognize the promise that, "*theirs is the kingdom*." And the Church, which does not act on the principle (half-way believed, it would seem, by many Protestants), that the invention of printing is the supplement to the Incarnation, has devotions suited to all her children; for these, the Rosary; for those the Stations of the Cross; there an old man prays at the altar of St. Joseph; yonder kneels a maiden at the altar of the Virgin Mother; while yet another in the distance strikes his breast, and in his heart cries out, "*God be merciful to me a sinner!*" "When I enter a Catholic church," said an eminent Protestant minister to the writer, "and contemplate the reverence, the fervor of devotion, the adaptedness of the Church to the wants of all—learned and uncultured, rich and poor, young and old, I do not wonder that her followers lovingly name her, '*Our Holy Mother, the Church*;' and my heart sinks within me at the thought of our own lethargic services." The portal of the church is open, not on a part of one day of the week, but always, and the living nature of our practice springs directly from a living faith, which commences with the mystery of the Incarnation, goes through the Rosary, in which the life of our Saviour is vividly represented to our minds, and depicts in the Stations of the Cross the Redemption of mankind, bringing it home to us in a way that embraces the whole spirit of Christian prayer. No, the audience-chamber of the house of God is, as it should be, ever easily accessible, and rarely indeed, even in our own country, so noted for hurry, business, and bustle, will the sanctuary be found vacant of worshippers! What a contrast with the meeting-houses! Into these no man can enter, if he would—nobody wants to enter, save for a few hours every seventh day. Why should he? They possess, even according to their frequenters, nothing holy; and we fully admit that from their own standpoint, their frequenters are right. On the contrary, the services of the Church are a complete fulfilment of the morning and evening sacrifices of the Old Law; and real, vivid faith is the key which unlocks the door.

A lively writer, in one of the monthlies, remarks: "*Our Catholic brethren, at least, rise up early!*" Had he continued his investigation he would have discovered not merely that they rise early to go to church, but that their devotion is no mere formal one when there; proving their full assurance that "this is the house of God!" this is truly the house of prayer! How can true Catholics act otherwise in church, since they know that the Author of every grace is really present? True it is, that the poor are the chief worshippers; but *we* have yet to learn that wealth makes a Christian, or that Christ did not foretell that the *poor should be always with us*. Hence they come very naturally to their own house, built by the poor, for the poor; often leaving the fastidious rich far behind them in spiritual graces. "The Church," says Lasteyria, "is the real mother of the poor, and the poor constantly recognize her as such. Stand, as the congregation departs, at the door of any Catholic church, if you wish to certify yourself of the fact. Does the beggar ever station himself at the door of the Protestant church? He places himself, as of right, by that where he recognizes that his appeal will not be disregarded."

One of the Protestant papers lately showed conclusively, and lamented in the *exposé* of the fact, that if by any chance a sudden desire to attend church service were to attack the entire non-Catholic portion of the population of any of our large cities, not *one-tenth* could find church accommodation! We have no means of proving the fact, but his figures carried conviction with them; and had it not been true, it is very unlikely that such a showing would have been made. If so, it looks much like a patent admission that the religions of our dissenting friends are not for the poor. On the other hand, the early stroller on any Sunday morning, in the same cities, can easily satisfy himself that by 8 A.M., several large Catholic congregations have already attended to their religious duties, and retired to give place in turn to others, chiefly of the poor, ere any considerable number of our opposing friends had "*turned side and shoulders, or moved heavy head.*" "Why is it," feelingly inquires one of their sectarian papers, "that the zeal and devotedness ever present with Romanists in the practice of a false devotion, should be wanting to us in the performance of true worship?"

How touching, too, is not the devotion of the Angelus, which ringing thrice a day, calls upon the faithful to detach their minds from worldly affairs, to elevate them from the cares of business to God, to recite and represent to themselves the mystery of the Incarnation, and to realize in the midst of the turmoil of business that they are travelling towards the next world! Has Protestantism anything analogous to show?

We would not willingly cast an imputation on any act of philanthropy, still less on any institution having for its object the amelioration of the condition of the outcast or the wretched. Acts of the kind referred to are not overabundant, and the world has not yet enough of such institutions even to relieve a tithe of the misery that exists! Yet we put it to the thoughtful (and for these especially we write), whether any special charity can be found outside the Church which does not bring upon the recipient an undefined, yet not undefinable, degradation! Is it, perchance, the almshouse, the widows' home, the asylum for the aged, or the charity hospital among Protestants? Ah! my friends, we know something of such places. Circumstances have made it our duty to know a great deal about them, and we have never returned from a visit to one of them without a sensation of horror, not so much occasioned by the wretchedness we there witnessed, as by the supercilious air of superiority with which the wretched beings compelled to be their inmates, were treated. Make it only manifest to us that there is one such institution in this broad land of ours where the sad recipients of charity are not treated more like criminals on Blackwell's Island (or wherever else it may be worse), than like fellow-beings in misfortune, and we shall be not only pleased in the interests of humanity, but stand ready to make the *amende honorable*. Have they free access to spiritual consolation, such as they desire? Are they not very frequently obliged to attend ministrations at which their inmost heart recoils? Are they not frequently made the sufferers of horrors the most atrocious, and which are carefully suppressed from the public, unless when the ever-officious and ubiquitous reporter manages to get an inkling of the facts, and thereby secure an article? Do they, in any way, compare with the gentle sway exercised by the Sisters or Brothers in institutions of the same nature, under Catholic auspices? We have proofs by the score that they do not, and our adversaries well know the facts to be as stated; but, best of all, are the poor inmates themselves aware of it, as is often and often manifested by their eagerness to obtain transfer or admission to the latter. Look at the manner in which the Church (when her poverty permits it), takes care of and tends the poor, the aged, the orphan, the outcast, the sick, the fallen, having special Orders of men and of women instituted and trained for the purpose, whose lives are given to these perennial charities; charities which last century after century; which outlast dynasties, survive governments, and show that they were instituted and are tended by those fully imbued with faith in the words of Christ, when He said, "The poor ye have always with you." Compared with these the other philanthropic works are like the gourd of Jonah: "They spring up in a night and they wither in a night." The spirit of the Master,



the great fountain of true charity, marks the former, while the latter are indelibly and unmistakably stamped with the soup-house style of benefaction and that of Mr. Bumble's *parochial relief*. It will not be forgotten, meanwhile, that a number of these institutions, nominally and professedly established for the benefit of the destitute, were conclusively shown up, some time since, in the papers of our metropolitan city as mere shams, by means of which, under philanthropic pretexts, a few swindlers fleeced the community by wholesale. Does any one ask an indorsement of our charitable institutions; let him ask the inmates of any of them, from the Small-pox Hospital to the House of the Good Shepherd; let him examine them all, from the Foundling Nursery to the Lazar-house and Insane Asylum. There are in them, gentlemen, no set times, when everything is arranged in apple-pie order for the inspection of a Board of Visitors; no brag inmates to be exhibited and praised; none of the reverse description, to be hustled out of the way, snubbed, and maltreated.

If, as is said, imitation be the sincerest kind of flattery, we have the best of reason to congratulate ourselves on the very open admissions in our favor, made by our opponents, who have, in sundry instances, attempted the rather up-hill task of establishing Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, who should perform the same work with our Religious Orders. Many advantages were publicly and openly stated as certain to result from such establishments; but most especial stress was laid upon the benefits resultant to the institutions of which these *quasi* Religions should have charge, as regarded morality and decency. Many attempts have been made in England, especially among Ritualists, and while the cases of entire failure have been many, the effort has, in the long run, not been entirely barren of good results; not, however, in the mode intended, or by securing the establishment of a single permanent Order, but by the fact that the attempt, or rather, the necessity which called for the effort, and the utter impossibility of its success under any other ægis than that of the Church of God, called the attention of the community to the work done by our noble Orders, and to the wants of those to whom it is their duty and delight to minister. In Prussia there is an Order of so-called "*Deaconesses*," which while it confessedly falls far short of the effectiveness of our Sisters of Charity, nevertheless supplied during the late war with France quite a number of hospital nurses, much superior to any that would have been attainable outside the Orders of the Church. Just in so far, however, as they have succeeded, they owe their success to the principles of the Church, and whenever they depart from these failure is the lamentable and inevitable consequence. Where do we find anything comparable with the heroic deeds of the Sisters

of Charity in hospitals, pest houses, asylums of all sorts, and on fields of battle? Have the testimony and admissions of the highest in command during our own late war ceased to be remembered? The soldiers of both armies, at least, who were tended and cared for by them, and who have survived their wounds, are not likely to forget their courage, their endurance, their patience, or their self-sacrifice.

Where, again, do we find the most accomplished teachers of youth but among the Religious Orders of the Church, and what more pregnant admission of their value and capacity can those opposed to us in religion make than by sending, as they often do, their sons to the Brothers of the Christian schools, and their daughters to one or other of the institutions under the charge of the female teaching Orders? How sublime are they not, in comparison with the constantly extinguished, because constantly married out, attempts at Religious Congregations among our dissenting friends! All Christendom knows, appreciates, and applauds the Sisters of Charity. Of the teaching Orders, male and female, it is well known by those who have come in contact with them, that in them an education suited to the highest capacity is imparted to their charges by men and women of the highest capacity, with whom teaching is a labor of love, and who are not, as is too frequently the case elsewhere, dependent upon the school as a mode of eking out a precarious livelihood.

The importance that the Catholic attaches to the presence of a clergyman at the hour of death is fairly, though quaintly, expressed in the popular phrase, that a man "*had the benefit of the clergy*," which is tantamount to saying that a priest was present when the decisive hour arrived. Of the nature and importance of the service of the Priest at that supreme moment Catholics do not need to be informed; and Protestants, sticklers though they profess themselves for Scripture, who so quietly, but persistently, ignore the warrant in St. James for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, are hardly likely, without large increase of grace, to understand. True it is that if the priest stood in the same relation to the dying Catholic, and had no more power of assisting him than has the parson or minister towards his moribund parishioner, there would be no necessity for the priest. Any one may recite or read prayers with and for the dying, but we know of no instance up to date in which a preacher has attempted to administer Extreme Unction. Yet the warrant and authority for those who are really in possession of Holy Orders to do so is perfectly clear, and it is a portion of Scripture with which our adversaries know least of all other texts what to do. Other texts they wrest, twist, refine upon, and explain away, but this they can it seems do nothing with, save simply ignore its existence. Here are the words: "Is any man sick among you?

Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man ; and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him." (*St. James v. : 14.*) Does language mean anything or does it not? Can a Scriptural warrant be clearer ; a command of inspiration more distinct and emphatic? How utterly out of place would not preaching be to a man in his agony ; and how vain and useless must not their causeless and needless insistence on being present seem to the preachers themselves! Doubtless, it is a delusion desirable to be kept up ; though on what argument of utility or advantage to the departing soul, we are utterly at a loss to imagine. Whereas, the priest of the Catholic Church proves daily, in obedience to this command, his apostolic mission ; and neither pestilence, field of carnage, bodily peril of any kind, nor effeminate dread of bringing home contagion and plague to "the bosom of a lovely spouse and darling children," hinder God's priests from the performance of their heroic duty in the hospital, the plague ships, the stricken city, or the tented field. Who that has read accounts of cholera or pestilence but knows of this cheerful performance of duty by priests in all ages? The experience of last year in the diocese of Bishop Elder, and in the whole district afflicted, proves what priests and sisters do in the work of charity. Who is there that remembers the yellow fever of Norfolk in our own land in 1854 but remembers, together with the steadfastness of the humble priest at that place, the prudence, the discretion (we were almost tempted to say the politroonery!) of the ministers? But they were right in their own way. They knew they were of no avail to the dying, just as they must acknowledge in their inmost heart that they are not of as much advantage to the living as would be any good book of sermons of their own theological school. Why, then, blame them? We do not blame them *for running away from the danger*; but for *trying to keep up the pretence of their utility* till the danger came, and now again after it is past. No more learned, no more reputable, no more straightforward antagonist has the Church ever had than Leibnitz. We give his words on the value and authority for this purely Catholic practice:

"The anointing of the sick is supported by the words of holy Scripture and the interpretation of the Church—a safe guide for Catholics. I do not see what objection can be made to the holy custom. Of old it was attended by miraculous cures. This miraculous gift, as well as the other extraordinary graces, have become less frequent since the firm establishment of the Church ; but we are not to suppose that, even in olden times, all the sick who received extreme unction were cured. What remains at this day, what will always remain, and never deceive us, is the virtue of curing souls that are suitably disposed ; a virtue which, according to St. James, gives the remission of sins, as well as increase of faith and courage. Never have we more need of help

than at that hour, when life is in danger; when, amid all the terrors of death, it is necessary to repel the fiery darts of Satan, then more violent than ever."—(*Syst. Theol.*)

A silent but none the less sincere tribute to the Church is offered in the use of her prayers in the service of the only Protestant sect possessing a regular liturgy, for the formation of which our Missal and Breviary would seem to have been culled and translated; and some of the sectaries have not been above translating and adopting (first having divested them of everything distinctively Catholic) several purely Catholic books of devotion, more especially Thomas A'Kempis's *Imitation of Christ* and the *Meditations of S. Bonaventure*. All history testifies to the zeal, purity, disinterestedness, and laboriousness of our missionaries, and in a special manner Bancroft (our own historian), to these qualities as exhibited by the Jesuit missionaries of North America. Indeed, the effectual mission work of the world has been done by Catholics; with the rest, it has been, for the most part, but a sham or a trading venture; and sometimes, as in the case of the Sandwich Islands, a highly successful speculation. All poetry pays its tribute to the customs and practices of Catholicity, in the frequent allusions to "the passing bell," "the vesper bell," "the nuns' sweet hymns," "the cowed monk," "the shriven penitent;" and just as without the Church the literature of antiquity would have been irrecoverably lost, so but for her, architecture, sculpture, painting, and music would hardly exist, and life would be as grim, as angular, and as cheerless as a Protestant meeting-house. Yet strange to say, those who can calm down their dislike and even hatred for each other under no other circumstances, are able to repress temporarily their bitterness, and strike hands for the nonce, that they may deal an insidious stab at the spouse of Christ; and yet not strange to say; since this same state of affairs has long since and frequently been foretold in Scripture.

We close this article, by calling attention to the fact, that not a few bold moves have been made to stir up the fires of religious strife in this country, and although we have full confidence in the sound common sense of the American people (ourselves born and bred here, and proud of it), we would yet fain hope that unscrupulous and scheming demagogues may not even for a time rule the soberer reason of men, who, if so ruled, will hereafter be as much ashamed of themselves, as were the Know-Nothings after their defeat.

When Washington was unanimously elected the first President of the Republic, a congratulatory address was made to him by the Catholics of the country, in which they state:

"This prospect of material prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us on another account,

because, while our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well-founded title to claim, from her justice, equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood spilt under your eyes, and of our common exertions for our defence, under your auspicious guidance; rights rendered more dear to us by the remembrance of former hardships."

The Illustrious President made answer :

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government; or the important assistance they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."—(SPARKS'S *Washington*, vol. xii.)

It is needless for us to assert that :

"We ask for no exclusive privileges whatever; we claim only our clear and undoubted rights in common with our fellow-citizens."—(ABP. SPALDING, *Del. ap. Pastoral*.)

## THE FALL AND RISE OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

*Acta et Decreta Synodi Plenaria Episcoporum Hiberniæ habitæ apud Maynutiam.* Anon., MDCCCLXXV. Dublin, Typis Browne et Nolan.

*The Irish Race.* By Rev. Aug. I. Thebaud, S. J. D. Appleton & Co., New York, 1873.

*Ireland under English Rule.* By the Rev. Father Perraud. Dublin, James Duffy, 1864.

*Life of Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle.* By William I. Fitzpatrick, 2 vols. Donahoe, Boston, 1862.

HOMER says that the day man becomes a slave he loses half his worth. The horizon of his aspirations must be very narrow, if not quite wiped out. *Nolens volens* he lives and moves and almost has his being for the profit of another. So it is with a country. When it has not or loses autonomy, though it may not be merged in the superior country, yet among the nations it is as if it existed not. Ireland is an instance in point. The bounties of nature have been lavished on her with a liberal hand; but they either lie dormant or are subsidized to the aggrandizement of the

ruling country. It is not claimed that she has resources to enable her to rival England in agriculture, manufactures, or commerce; but Sir Robert Kane, an accepted authority, proves, that she has means within herself of sustaining comfortably a population of about nineteen millions. Ireland could at least more than rival Belgium. But having written in some detail on these matters in the January number, and mindful of the adage of the *repetite crambes*, we must pass on to the subject of this paper.

There was a time not many "yesterdays" ago, when educated men scrupled not to assert that the Catholic Church fostered "ignorance, and was opposed to light;" but this charge has been relegated to the *pagani*—the country press, and pulpit. The charge needs no lengthy refutation here; however, we will quote the testimony of two great names: St. Augustine exclaims of the Church, "*Tu pueriliter pueros, fortiter juvenes, quiete senes, prout cujusque non corporis tantum sed et animi atas est, exerces et doces.*"<sup>1</sup> (*Moribus Eccl.*, lib. i., cap. 30.) Evidently he feared not the boldest ranges of speculation when guided by the proper authority. He is the acknowledged Father of Christian philosophy. Bossuet, a kindred genius and almost his disciple in later times, draws with a master hand his estimate of the importance of human knowledge. As the passage is rather long we must condense his language though we thereby mar its splendor.

"I am not one of those who undervalue human learning. I confess I cannot contemplate the discoveries of science and arts without astonishment. Man has almost changed the face of the earth. He has tamed the fiercest animals and disciplined their strength. He has made the antagonistic elements of fire and water minister to his wants. Nay, more—he has mounted to the heavens and made the stars to mark a safe path on his journeys over the sea, and forced even the sun to keep count of the hours for the regulation of his daily life. He ranges through the extent of nature, and there is no part of the universe that does not bear traces of his industry."

If, therefore, in times past or even now, the state of education is not what we could wish in Ireland, the Church is not to blame; and before we conclude this paper we hope to be able to prove at whose door the blame justly lays. She has been made and kept poor and held up to scorn. "*Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se quam quod ridiculos homines facit*" (*Juvenal*, sec. 3, 152) is an experience she has endured too long.

There were three earthly things Augustine desired to see but

---

<sup>1</sup> Thou teachest and trainest children in childlike fashion, youth more solidly, the old with gentleness, as their age and mental growth require.

did not,—Rome in its glory, Tully declaiming, and Paul preaching. Britain claims that she enjoyed all three; but Ireland makes no such claim. St. Paul never announced the glad tidings of salvation to her sons; and no broken arches or crumbling ruins of fallen temples remain to show that Roman power ever extended to her shores. The pages of Thucydides and Livy may have been unknown to her scholars, yet it is proved that from a very early period she had letters of her own; and when the great Apostle St. Patrick came, he found a people partially prepared to embrace the Gospel when it was properly demonstrated to them. Soon after her conversion she became a great nursery of learning and religion.

Those even moderately acquainted with history know that towards the latter part of the fourth century, the old order of civilization was breaking up, and that a long period of strife ensued before the new order was established. France, Italy, Spain—all Western Europe was convulsed to the depths. Writers have used several figures to express the condition of society during this crisis. They call it a second deluge; and the Church, like the ark, floating over the troubled waters preserved for the benefit of after ages, the deposit of faith and learning intrusted to her care. But these social convulsions did not affect Ireland. Separated from the continent, her insular position preserved her from the northern hordes. "About the middle of the fifth century," says Görres, "St. Patrick established religion in the Emerald Isle. The manners of her people were soon refined; great numbers of schools were erected, and science and piety flourished. While Europe was torn by wars, Ireland reposed in safety. It seemed as if cloisters and hermits were transferred from the Nile; and during three centuries Ireland produced eight hundred saints, and converted to Christianity the North of England and a great part of Germany that was then pagan." (Mystik.) In those days Ireland was often called "New Rome," or the "Holy Isle," and persons flocked there from France and England to receive an education. Monasteries dotted the slopes and valleys, and wherever there was a monastery there was sure to be a school. Often these monasteries were erected into Episcopal sees; their names are still preserved in the Irish hierarchy. Clonfert, Emly, Ossory testify to this, though the schools that gave them origin have almost passed from the memory of man.

But those days and abodes of peace were now to be disturbed; her insular position could no longer protect her. The Danes came, and Ireland to this day bears marks of their visit. The people were slaughtered; churches and schools were burned, and learning almost extinguished. The great school of Armagh with its

seven thousand scholars was scattered, and so in other places. We cannot here recount their evil deeds; but we know education suffered by their presence. The plain of Clontarf decided their destiny; and they were driven back to Scandanavia, or those who remained soon amalgamated with the people.

A century later the Normans made their appearance in Ireland. One of them tells us they found themselves as if in a new world; so unlike was Ireland to the countries of Europe. Though the Danes wrought much destruction, yet the laws and customs of the country remained intact. The Normans professed the Catholic faith and avowed that they came to encourage religion and restore discipline. But it soon was manifest that they aimed at conquest and the extermination of the natives. Learning under such circumstances could make no great advancement. The science most necessary was how to defend their homes, and not to transcribe parchments or found colleges. Father Thebaud<sup>1</sup> remarks that the arrival of the Normans was at the commencement of a transition era—that of the Crusades. It will always be a mooted question whether they resulted in more evil than good; but there can be no doubt much evil was the consequence. Millions left home to fight for the Cross and rescue their brethren from the thralldom of the Mohammedan. They went more as a mob than an army, and knowing little of the dangers they had to encounter. Very many of them returned to Europe not fervent Christians, but deeply tainted with the old heresies of the East. Under the guise of perpetuating their military organization, they laid the foundation of those secret societies—as the very names of some betray—that now are the affliction of modern society. The old traditions of the Gnostics and Manichees were introduced into Europe, and the ablest theologians, such as St. Thomas, were forced to discuss the very foundation principles of religion, theology. Ireland did not belong to the European family, and took no part in these Crusades. She, therefore, escaped the contagion of the ancient heresies. Had she had control of her own destinies at this period when the great universities on the continent were founded, who can estimate the benefits she might have conferred on religion and learning? But instead of laying the foundations of universities and being a light and guide to Europe, she was engaged during all this time in combat with her troublesome neighbors of the Pale. Within the Pale an effort was made to establish a university, once in Dublin and at another time in Drogheda, but the Irish either would not, or could not frequent them, and they failed. Two social systems were struggling for the mastery, the feudal and the Brehon system, and the result is known.

---

<sup>1</sup> Irish Race.



Spenser and the early English writers are very severe on the *Brehon* laws and customs. They either did not understand or wilfully misrepresented them. Part of the *Brehon* code has of late years been translated and published, and is, therefore, submitted to the criticism of competent judges. *Campion*, an Englishman, and afterwards a Jesuit martyr, has left a description of a school of *Brehon* law as he saw it in 1571. "They (the rising *Brehons*) speak Latin like a vulgar tongue;" and he saw "several of them stretched at full length conning their tasks, and learning by rote fragments of the Roman and Irish law—the Civil Institutes and *Brehon* law, at which they continued for many years." Those who spent sometimes sixteen years and more in the study of these codes could not afterwards be barbarous judges. Of the civil law Chancellor Kent writes: "The whole body of the civil law excites never-failing curiosity, and receives the homage of scholars as a singular monument of human wisdom;" and he quotes Sir Matthew Hale as declaring, that "a man could never understand law as a science without first resorting to the Roman law for information."<sup>1</sup> This the Irish law students did; and we are justified, therefore, in concluding that the *Brehon* code was no barbarous jargon, and that the *Brehons* were, or should be, intelligent judges.

From the foregoing outline we can learn why no great university was established in Ireland up to the dawn of the Reformation, though education was by no means neglected. Before that, from Henry the Second's time, the contest was between Norman and Irish—between the feudal and the *Brehon* system; henceforth the tenor not only of the education but of the whole Irish question was forced into a new direction. The Irish question merged into the struggle between Protestantism and Catholicity.

When the Apostles went forth to convert the nations they did not preach up sedition, they appealed to the human reason and conscience; St. Paul did not seek to burn the Parthenon. When St. Patrick came to Ireland he did not commence a war of extermination and a religious plantation. But Protestantism pursued a course of its own. Like *Eolus* unchaining the winds, it let loose the passions. It proclaimed itself the herald of liberty, but despotism followed in its train. It could desolate, but it could not build up the Church of God. After the lapse of three centuries, with all its power and wealth, it has to confess itself unable to convert the Irish. Like Milton's cloud, "its sable side" was turned towards the Irish Catholics, and "its silver lining" was for the Protestants. In plain prose, Protestantism was a weapon to crush Catholic faith and to enrich the small fraction of its adherents.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kent's Commentaries, vol. i., page 507.

As an evangelist, Henry VIII. was not a success even in his own country. Early in his career he called in the aid of the school-master in Ireland. In 1537 an act was passed ordering every parish minister "to keep or cause to be kept a school in his parish, in order to learn himself, and introduce the English tongue." Five years later several religious houses were suppressed, and the property bestowed on favorites on condition "of keeping household and hospitalitie." The seizure of Church property and the enriching of a small party was begun. We learn from Spenser that the Protestant clergy were in a deplorable condition, and excited only contempt. In 1570 another act was passed, providing for the erection of free schools in every diocese and under English masters; the end in view was to "secure a due obedience from the people to their princes and rulers, whose ignorance of those high points touching their damnation," arose from the youth being brought up in no school, public or private. To crown the work of Protestant education, Queen Elizabeth, in 1591, founded Trinity College, with the privileges of a university, on the site of the Augustinian Monastery of All Hallows, now called College Green, but at that time on the outskirts of Dublin. The new State Church had obtained control of education both parochial and university. Vast sums were expended, but education did not flourish. The Irish rejected the Reformation, and the parish or diocesan schools had few or no pupils except the children of the teacher and minister. Wealthy Protestants who were English sent their sons to be educated in England. During this reign the Catholics managed to keep up schools of their own. Archdeacon Lynch, who wrote under Queen Elizabeth, states that there were in Ireland thirty-one Cathedral (Catholic) schools, and the Religious Orders had several more. The Jesuits had twelve colleges. King James made it a condition of the Plantation of Ulster that schools should be erected, and set apart 100,000 acres for that purpose. This was the origin of the royal schools of Armagh, Dungannon, Raphoe, and four others. Trinity College received a large *bonus* of lands. These schools were not well attended. In 1633 we find the Lord Deputy complaining that "these schools were ill governed, that the lands were either dissipated or concealed, and the money applied underhand to the maintenance of Popish schoolmasters." It was complained that even the Plantation Catholic schools were so large "that they were universities rather than schools." The Jesuits, early in the reign of Charles I., founded a university, "a fair college building," in Dublin.

It would seem impossible for Catholics to keep schools, not to say a university, when the whole spirit of the government was against them. Many circumstances conspired in their favor.

Though good public highways were laid out from an early period, as we learn from the (*Leabhar na g-Ceart*), Book of Rights, they were not as numerous as they are now. The country was almost covered with woods, and towns were few. The army was stationed in quarters far apart, and the natives, owing to this, could escape molestation. Besides, the laws, though bad enough, had not acquired "the vicious perfection" they did in after times. Moreover, penal laws against conscience and religion generally defeat themselves; man is naturally unwilling to persecute his neighbor unless he has some great interest to maintain. Protestants in the midst of a large Catholic population desired to be in peace, when not molested themselves. Catholic institutions were therefore connived at or tolerated, but on every outburst of puritanical prejudice they were closed or destroyed. The Catholic University of Back Lane, Dublin, was seized and handed over to Trinity College. The very year in which this occurred a most important work in Irish literature was undertaken in the mountains of Donegal—the *Annals of the Four Masters*. Two friars, the brothers O'Cleary, assisted by two others wrote this great history in four years. Manuscripts and records were fast disappearing, and they sent agents into every part of the country to collect materials. It was a timely undertaking, for in a few years the whole land was torn by civil strife, which led to the formation of the Confederation of Kilkenny.

Three hundred years before, in this good city of Kilkenny, King John's Parliament proclaimed utter war on the "mere" Irish; now another Parliament proclaimed reconciliation—a Union. *Pro Deo, Rege et Patria, Hiberni Unanimes*, was the motto of the great seal of the Confederation. Delegates were elected from every county and borough town. An executive, called the Supreme Council, was appointed to discharge all the functions of a duly regulated government. Protestants were admitted by pledging themselves to uphold the cause of the Confederates. It was a National Parliament, perhaps the only really national one that has ever assembled in Ireland since the Norman invasion. All hearts beat high with hope of righting their native land; but these hopes were soon to end in utter disappointment. In the first article of the Remonstrance presented to the King's Commissioners, in 1642, the Confederate Catholics complain that they were "debarred from learning in universities and public schools." The bishops engaged to establish colleges in various places, and the Supreme Council proposed to found a university. The Pope sent over a Nuncio with large supplies of money and arms, and France and Spain were represented by agents. But in a short time old jealousies were renewed, and the Confederation ended in disaster, and the country lay at the mercy of the Protector. It does not fall

within our purpose to give details of this eventful period. In the course of a very few years five-sixths of the people had perished, and of those who survived, over 60,000 were shipped to the Barbadoes and the tobacco districts of America. Not one of these was alive in twenty years. How fared it with the Catholics? The long Parliament declared that popery or idolatry could not be tolerated, and priests were ordered under pain of death to depart the country. It is recorded of a friar that he chose, in the middle of a vast bog, a spot harder than the rest, and built a hut on it as a school. Large numbers of youths erected little huts around, to study the elements of learning, and bore with joy the inconveniences of their position. Only one aged bishop existed in the land. And yet Milton at this time was publishing his high-sounding *Areopagitica*, which modern liberals admire as the handbook of free press and free speech.

After the Restoration the Irish founded colleges in several parts of France, out of the wreck of their fortunes, and by aid from friends; and the laws not being rigidly enforced they opened schools at home. Sir William Petty writes of the Irish peasantry, in 1672, that "French and Latin were not unknown to many of them. The latter, amongst the poorest Irish, and chiefly in Kerry, where it is very freely spoken." The Marquis of Lansdowne, a direct descendant of Sir William, owns great tracts of lands in Kerry, and we doubt if his tenants are now so well acquainted with French and Latin, as when his ancestor came into possession two hundred years ago. At this time *Erastus Smith*, one of Cromwell's troopers, left the rents of 12,958 acres of land to establish three free schools in Galway, Drogheda, and Tipperary. His schoolmasters were bound publicly to pray and read the Scriptures. He found it easier to rob the Irish of their lands than of their faith: "My Lords," he writes to the governors, "my designe is not to reflect upon any, only I give my judgement why those schools are so consumptive, which was, and is, and will be (if not prevented), the many popish schools their neighbors, which as suckers do starve the tree. If parents will exclude their children because prayers, catechism, and exposition are commanded, I cannot help it, for to remove that barre is to make them seminaries of Popery." The Catholic spirit must have great recuperative powers to enable the Catholics of Ireland to outrival Protestant schools endowed with their property.

During three-quarters of a century after the expulsion of King James, the ingenuity of Parliament was taxed to devise additional plans for the destruction of what they styled Popery. The result is enshrined for all time in the penal code. Hitherto the schoolmaster could wield his rod unnoticed, unless, like the *miles gloriosus*, he made himself too ostentatious. But now he was put in

the same category with the wolf and the friar. It was made an offence to be punished by death for any one to teach a school either public or private. Yet like the friar, the schoolmaster was "abroad," and survived the ordeal. He originated what were known as the "hedge schools." Pure air and free ventilation; easy means of ingress and egress; a just amount of gymnastic exercise to relieve studies—these are the *desiderata* that have puzzled modern philanthropists and educators. The versatile talents of the Irish schoolmaster were equal to these difficulties. Plato discoursed philosophy *inter Sylvas Academi*, and why could not he do the same? In some remote corner beneath a hedge and spreading tree he gathered his pupils, and they were not "cabined, cribbed, confined," as were those who studied under the *ollamhs* of yore. Ventilation was pure; fires were not thought of; and health was promoted by regular exercise, as his scholars, in turns, had to ascend and descend the tallest branches of trees to snuff the danger from afar, and give the alarm when the spy was on the trail. Others, as we have seen, retired to the bogs and erected huts with turf, and doubtless as they gazed on the

*"Pauperis et tuguri congestum cespite culmens,"*

they felt themselves as learned Fellows as any beneath the shadow of the "Silent Sister" of Trinity College. Bishop England, in one of his letters on the Roman Chancery, gives a vivid picture of these events witnessed by his father. Dr. Doyle, in a moment of splendid musing, writes, how "the haunts of these men in times of persecution are still pointed out by the aged inhabitants with a sort of pride mingled with piety; and they say, there a bishop administered confirmation; we remember how he lived in yonder old walls, in common with the young priests whom he prepared for the mission. Oh! if you saw him, he was like St. Patrick himself." The Catholics were, step by step, deprived of every right, civil, social, and natural. Dr. Curry, in his *Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland*, tells us that in 1745 the very existence of Catholics was ignored by the law, they had no right which the law should respect, though they were three-fourths of the population. It is plain that were such laws strictly enforced during over half a century, scarcely a Catholic could be found in the land. But they were not, as they were aimed at property more than religion. Arthur Young, a learned Englishman, who wrote an account of his travels through Ireland in 1776 says: "I have conversed on the subject with some of the most distinguished characters in the kingdom, and I cannot after all but declare that the scope, purport, and aim of the laws of discovery as executed, are not against the Catholic religion, which increases under them, but against the industry and property of

whoever professes that religion." Even so, it surprises how the people survived the ordeal. Philosophers ascribe it to ethnological causes, or the laws of craniology. Father Thebaud<sup>1</sup> gives a more satisfactory solution.

The Irish, he remarks, well understood the difference between the temporal and the eternal, and when a choice had to be made, they chose the latter in preference to the former. Their faith inspired them with a spirit of longanimity, with courage and with hope; like Abraham, they hailed their redemption in the distance. In the words of another, "Our books, our masters, and our schools were such, no doubt, as became a people once rich and learned, but again reduced to want and barbarism; withal they were sufficient to guard the sacred fire, now turned into thick water, until better times would return, when, like that found by the prophet, it would be *received once more and borne in triumph to the temple.*"

Under these circumstances, ecclesiastical colleges could not exist in Ireland; but out of the wreck of their property, and by the generosity of friends, the Irish founded several on the Continent. These supplied priests for the dangerous mission in their native land. The position of those priests was an anomalous one. They were not always persecuted, but the law, like the sword of Damocles, was constantly over their heads. Men, trained in all the refinement of French manners, and whose minds were stored with theology, philosophy and eloquence, returned to minister to a rude people, not in churches of mediæval splendor, but "wandering over mountains, in deserts and caves." We could give the names of many, but one must suffice, the Rev. Father O'Leary. He was educated in France, and soon after his return took his rank in wit as the peer of Swift, and his superior in Christian grace. His society was sought by the first men of the land, and Senators honored him with their eulogiums. "Did I not know him to be a Christian clergyman, by his works I should suppose him to be a philosopher of the Augustan age." But this is somewhat in anticipation.

Thus Catholic education, as far as law could effect it, was eliminated. The maxim of Lord Bacon was verified: knowledge—that is, Protestant knowledge, if there was such a thing—was power. Every one, from the coal porter to the viceroy felt it. There were twenty-seven, if not more, endowed schools; these yearly sent a large number of students to the University of Trinity College. To its graduates was open the path to fame and wealth and power. The Catholics were looked down upon as slaves, and as such they had lost, not "half their worth," but almost the whole of it, for they

<sup>1</sup> In his work on the Irish Race.

could not be sold in the market. "Where this is the case in any part of the world," says Edmund Burke, "those who are free are by far the most proud and jealous of their freedom. Freedom is to them not only an enjoyment, but a kind of rank and privilege." Those men were proud and jealous of their privileges; very many of them had refined social virtues and generous impulses, and some were men of rare eloquence. But the Catholics generally listened to their dithyrambs as the helots, in Athens, listened to Demosthenes discoursing *on the Crown*. Those men aimed to perpetuate a caste, and not to create a nation. To descend from their pride of place and ascendancy, and be fellow-citizens with their fellow-countrymen, the Irish Catholics, scarcely entered their minds. And when the alternative was forced on them, many of them preferred to sell the independence of their country, than share it in equality with the Catholics, as Ormond, a century and a half before, betrayed Ireland, rather than see the confederate Catholics enjoy religious liberty. Even Grattan, with all his declamation about Ireland and independence, affected towards the Catholics a consciousness of superiority.

The last part of the last century was pregnant with great events. It produced the American, and about twenty years later, the French Revolution. Then originated what is now known by the words "instalments of justice." The instalments of wrong were persistent and logical; but the instalments of justice, if meant as such, followed no fixed law; and if meant as mercy, they were "strained." They have thus far obeyed the dictates of that imperial mistress, *necessity*, of which the English statesmen seem to be such clever adepts. Under the pressure of the times, the Catholics had restored to them many rights. Nay, in the very exuberance of liberality, the English government not only conceded religious toleration, but established and endowed the College of Maynooth. Some even proposed to endow a great Catholic University, though they are still hesitating on the subject in this last quarter of the nineteenth century. Mr. Pitt and his friends did not admire the principles of the French revolutionists; and as the Irish must have pastors, they concluded it was safer to enable them to study at home. We have before us proofs to sustain these statements, but do not suppose it necessary to quote them.

In 1733, besides the existing schools, the government established what were known as the *Charter Schools*, for the express purpose of educating the children of Catholics in the Protestant religion. It is estimated that about a million dollars a year were spent on these schools. They were *Souper* schools on a respectable scale, and they failed. They were followed by the Kildare schools.

The Kildare schools at first had the sanction of prominent Catholics, as it was promised they would be impartial. But, "do men gather figs from thorns?" They had poison on their wings, as was soon discovered. There arose then a man who marks an era in the history of modern education in Ireland,—the illustrious I. K. L., James Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. Discarding the tone of servility engendered by the penal laws, he appealed to justice and the spirit of the British Constitution. He insisted that the Catholics were subjects, and should be put on a par with any other portion of the people; they could not and should not be content with anything less. He crippled the iniquitous system of the tithes. He dealt a blow at the Established Church, and announced its downfall; and he upset the Kildare schools. The Irish, he urged, were naturally intellectual and fond of learning; but the fountains of education were designedly corrupted, and they could not partake of it. We enrich our pages with one lofty passage from his writings on the subject:

"But let not the group confound us; let us take a single captive and view him in his prison of the soul, incapable, almost, of counting by notches the days of his captivity. Let us view him, seated amidst one of his ancient cities, on the side of some decayed temple, amazed at the lofty grandeur of its mouldering arches, but ignorant, perhaps, that the very soil existed a century before. But let him only be made acquainted with the history of his country, let her heroes, her saints, and her sages pass in review before his enraptured imagination—let the chiding spirit of one of her orators point out to him the wreck of his country, and the gloomy melancholy will confer more real pleasure than the sceptre of a monarch could bestow; but the effect will not stop here. He will be aroused from his lethargy; he will vindicate his own rights and that of his country, or enrich her with the product of his labor or his art."

Of Bishop Doyle, Cardinal Wiseman expressed himself as follows, on his visit to Carlow, in 1858:

"He remembered, when young himself, reading the glowing letters which awakened anew an enthusiastic feeling in every one who perused them, which, while they confounded the enemies of the faith, encouraged its friends, and which might be said to be the first trumpet-note of that outspoken Catholicity, and bold avowal of faith, which had since become the general law of the country. He remembered the enemies of their faith perplexed—struck by wonder at the man whose courage and ability, and address and learning and eloquence, enabled him to speak so powerfully in defence and vindication of his religion."

The Kildare schools vanished and were succeeded by the



*National School* system, which, with various modifications, has continued to exist down to the present.

This system of primary education originated with Lord Stanley in 1831. It was intended to be truly *national*, and not to be used injudiciously for the purpose of a proselytism. To secure the confidence of all parties, Catholic as well as Protestant, stringent rules were drawn up for the management of these schools. Lord Stanley stated "that for the success of the undertaking much must depend on the character of the individuals who compose the board of education." The government pledged itself that all religious opinions should be fairly represented in the board. But this engagement was not kept. In 1845 the board received a charter of incorporation, and it was stipulated that the members should never be less than four, nor more than fifteen. The following are the proportions in which Catholics appear on the board from its formation. The first commissioners were seven; of these five were Protestants and two Catholics. Between 1838 and 1853, of the seventeen members appointed to fill up vacancies, eleven were Protestants and six Catholics. From 1853 to 1860 the board attained its maximum of fifteen members, and nine were Protestants and six were Catholics. Now the Catholics were more than three-fourths of the population, and instead of being in the minority should have had a majority in the board. The consequence was, that when delicate questions regarding religious instruction were referred to this board, the majority invariably inclined towards the State religion. We have before us well-authenticated facts to prove this. Books, as much, if not more than teachers, tell the spirit of the school. Two series of class-books were prepared, one for religious and the second for profane subjects. They were fourteen in number; thirteen of them were compiled by Englishmen, and only one by an Irishman, a Dr. Sullivan, an Ulster Protestant. The Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Whately, a member of the board, drew up a book of Scripture Lessons. He pledged himself to the sincerest impartiality; how well he kept his pledge we may learn from the following extract found in his *Life*, written by his daughter. He said: "The education supplied by the National Board is gradually supplanting the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. I believe that mixed education is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me." This was impartiality with a vengeance! How was Irish history taught? in three lines. This

was not all. The editors taught the pupils to thank God for having made them happy *English* children. Here is a morsel of a hymn that used to be sung in school :

"I thank the goodness and the grace  
That on my birth have'smiled,  
And made me in these Christian days  
A happy *English* child!"

The following is the number of pupils attending the National Schools, December 31st, 1876, and the religious denominations :

PROVINCE.	RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION.				Total.
	Roman Catholic.	P. E. Church.	Presbyterian.	Other persuasions.	
Leinster, . .	199,287	9,375	1,164	444	
Munster, . .	268,068	7,227	506	605	
Connaught, .	170,938	4,894	633	287	
Ulster, . .	181,072	71,163	109,165	7,387	
					1,032,215

In the mixed schools where the teachers are Protestant the percentage of pupils is more than 50 per cent. Protestant, and in Ulster the percentage is 107 per cent.

Now, if precautions against proselytism had to be made we would expect that in the Catholic districts they would be in behalf of the Protestant children, and in Ulster in behalf of the Catholic. Let us see. The old rule was that children should be obliged not to remain, if of a different creed from the religious instructor. This rule was twisted so as to mean that the teacher could not oblige them to remain. A very wide difference. In the first case the teacher was obliged to remove the pupils when of a different creed ; in the second case he was not ; the children might remain without the consent of parents or pastor. The schools were managed strictly according to the old rule in the Catholic districts ; but in Ulster, the Protestant *pale*, the second rule was enforced. Protestant landlord influence was brought to bear on the schools, and parents were often afraid to oppose it. All this is matter of record. It was not denied ; it was openly avowed. Hence the " National System " called forth remonstrance from an early day. It was assailed in the press, Parliament was petitioned, and the bishops laid the matter before Rome. All this in time had its effect. Rome declared in favor of denominational schools, but pronounced no final judgment on the National System. Various modifications have been introduced, so that if all danger be not prevented it is greatly lessened. The board of commissioners are now twenty, one-half of whom are Catholics. Parochial school property is not vested in the board, but in the parochial managers, and we learn from the papers that the Irish language is now taught in them. The

Synod of Maynooth, held in 1875, laid down these statutes, which are to be strictly observed by all pastors: 1. Books containing aught repugnant to faith or morals are to be absolutely rejected. 2. No book treating of faith or morals to be introduced unless first approved by the Ordinary. 3. Bishops and parish priests to provide in each parish a sufficient number of schools. 4. That they, in co-operation with the laity, constantly urge on the government to grant more equitable conditions with regard to these schools. 5. As far as possible that school property be vested in trustees, to wit, the bishop, the parish priest, and one or more persons approved by the bishop. 6. The parish priest in person or by his vicar should visit at least every week the National Schools, attended by the Catholic children of his parish, and see that the teachers properly discharge their duties; and also give religious instruction and make an entry in the register kept for the purpose. To neglect this duty during four successive weeks renders the priest liable to severe censure by the Ordinary. It is furthermore enjoined on pastors not to solicit aid from the board to erect schools without the consent of the bishop, nor to transfer the title of schools already erected to the Commissioners. These precautions were deemed essential to prevent abuse and guard the rights of Catholic parents and children. But the government has the right to inspect these schools.

We have seen that there are a million pupils attending the National Schools, 79 per cent. of whom are Catholics. But we are not to suppose that these are the only Catholic children receiving primary education. In nearly all towns of any importance there are schools for girls conducted by the Sisters, and for boys by the Christian Brothers. It is a well-established fact, that personal devotion and Christian charity can and do what salaried officers never can. Our hospitals and schools prove this. The schools of the Brothers are thronged, the best order and cleanliness prevail, the schoolbooks are equal and in many respects superior to the government ones. They give the elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic; and they are not ashamed to recall the saints and heroes, "the cloud of witnesses," to the pride and glory of Ireland.

It is almost within the memory of men still living when Catholic colleges for intermediate education could be opened. They were generally on an unpretending scale, as the people were just beginning to repair their own fortunes. Yet some, such as Carlow, Thurles, and Kilkenny presented an imposing front. But they could not compete with the endowed Protestant colleges. The author of a book, who signs himself an *Ulsterman*, remarks that in the early stages of their college course the Protestant students outnumber Catholics; but after fifteen years and upwards the Catholics were far in the

majority. How was this? The Protestant had passed to the University, but the Catholic had to continue in his college to receive all the education he was ever to receive, for there was no University for him.

Over thirty years ago the Queen's Colleges were erected, now clothed with the powers of a University. But as they are based on the secular system, neutrality in religion, they were condemned by Rome. Some are surprised at this; but can religion ever be a neutral question? Religion is a science, and has its prime principles from which deductions may be drawn, just as mathematics or any other human science. Religion teaches that man originally was created after the image of God, was surrounded with honor and glory, and little less than the angels. A learned pundit in his chair coolly states to his pupils that he is a little superior to his ancestor, the monkey. Can both these propositions be true? Impossible. For these and other reasons the Church condemns the neutral system. The majority of those who now frequent the Queen's Colleges go there to study some practical course, such as engineering or medicine. Those colleges are practically a failure.

Within the past year Catholic intermediate education has been recognized, and a law passed to put it upon a solid footing. We have not read the act, but hope it is equal to the requirements of a Catholic people. This last "instalment of justice" must lead to another,—the granting of a charter to the Catholic University.

The mere granting of a *charter* cannot, by any means, satisfy the Irish Catholics, as it would only give a legal recognition to its academical diplomas. The people have a right to claim more,—the Catholic University, to fulfil its functions, should be endowed. This can now be accomplished without injustice to any party. What was styled the Church of Ireland was, from the beginning, a *magnum latrocinium*. Its dignitaries were enriched with the spoils of Catholics. Trinity College had over \$200,000 per annum. Its revenues and those of the Protestant Bishops could not be accurately ascertained. They held large estates, and rented them on long lease, on easy terms, taking a consideration in money, imitating the steward in the Gospel, who made friends with the mammon of iniquity. In 1829, after the granting of emancipation, Tom Moore started an Irish gentleman from his chambers, in Trinity College, in search of a religion, by exclaiming "Thank God, I now can become a Protestant." After Gladstone's act of disestablishment, a Protestant may exclaim, "Thank God, I can now become a Catholic." The stigma of his Church is removed. He can now search into her merits. The resources of the Establishment will be ascertained, and after settling all just claims, there will remain ample means to put Catholic educational institutions on a proper basis. No ascen-

dency, but just equality; Irishmen of all creeds will know they have a common country.

We have exhausted the proper limits of our paper, and, we fear, the patience of our readers. We have touched only on the *summa rerum* of education in Ireland. But it was not our aim to write a treatise on education. That must be done by abler pens than ours. In America some do not appreciate the Catholic University. High education is for the benefit of the few; why, then, trouble the poor with annual collections? They forget that the history of the world verifies the words of St. James, "that every good gift comes from above." When the higher and educated classes are unsettled in faith and morals, the lower soon suffer in consequence. We could accumulate proofs. Can mobs and riots regenerate Ireland? Had not O'Connell been a Catholic, what would she be to-day? Is it nothing that Catholic scholars can take care of her interests and reputation? And instead of its being thought that faith was for the uneducated, it is seen and known that it is compatible with and adorns the highest mental culture.

Therefore the Synod of Maynooth exhorts "all Bishops and priests and laity to favor, as far as they may, those who have satisfactorily completed their studies in the Catholic University. In this is our hope that we will effectually repel from our shores, the monsters of Rationalism and Indifference, and at last vindicate, for this Ireland of ours, her hereditary glory of being in name and fact, *the Ireland of Saints and Doctors.*"

---

## STEPS TO ATHEISM.

I READ some time ago in the *Correspondent*, a few articles bearing the title: "What is found in Old Letters?" Now old books also contain something. Lately I have been running through one that was printed first in 1717, and again in 1724. It is this latter edition that fell into my hands. Fortunately for me—however it may be with others—the aforesaid book deals with a subject which is not out of date. It is all upon atheism, or upon those who say that there is no God. Now though we live in an age of unusual light, it is our painful duty to confess that atheism, practical and in a manner doctrinal, is common among even what are called the educated classes. Many scientists openly favor it and teach it, and as unhappily in this instance, their word is law, others who know little or nothing, fall to echoing: "There is no God." It is sad to have to make such an acknowledgment at this stage of the world's existence; but the error itself is sadder still on account of its results. God is the basis of all religion, of morality, government, and society. To eject him is to ruin all that is desirable for man. There is nothing more nonsensical than atheism; it is the surest and worst road to every ruin.

This excessive evil does not culminate at once, for the adage says: *Nemo repente fit summus*. Like other diseases atheism has its stages. The book that I have been reading treats of the *origin*, not of the *nature* of the malady. Indeed, some of our modern great men assign a very grand origin to disbelief in God's existence. It is born, they claim, of intellect; it is especially the child of science and of progress. Higher civilization and culture infallibly beget it. But the author of my book is not quite so flattering. He was a Jesuit named Gengell, and a Pole at that. Who does not know that Jesuits are famed for saying and doing queer things? Fr. Gengell published his work at Brunsberg, and modestly called it *Gradus ad Atheismum*; or, as we would say in English: "Steps to Atheism." We shall draw on this book for the substance of this article. Note the *We* replacing the foregoing *I*. Since Fr. Gengell is about to speak, I must naturally be silent. As we journey on, the steps of more than a hundred years ago may appear very like the steps of to-day.

Fr. Gengell reduces his Steps to three: First, certain kinds of sins; secondly, heresies; thirdly, erroneous opinions. We might condense them into two, namely, errors of the intellect and of the will; but let the author have his way, since there is no great harm in it.

By "Steps to Atheism" is not meant anything inevitably conducing to a denial of God's existence or nature. In accordance with Holy Writ and the saints there is question only of a disposition which, once it possesses a soul, renders the descent to atheism exceedingly easy. And the atheism that we have in view is not moral atheism, namely the atheism of those who though they admit a God, live and act withal as if they believed nothing of the kind. Or as St. Paul writes to Titus (1 v. 16): "They profess that they know God, but in their works they deny him, being abominable, and incredulous, and to every good work reprobate." No, the atheists we are considering are formal and properly so called atheists; that is, men who deny *ore rotundo* that there is a God, or positively doubt his existence. Furthermore, to drop into the abyss of atheism we need not go over all the steps, one alone is quite enough.

Again, in all that we are about to say, we disclaim all intention to hurt any one's feelings. We speak only from a love of truth and with a view to bring back those who have strayed from its path. In the words of Lactantius, we shall deem ourselves to have lived long enough and to have done our duty as men, should our labor free only one soul from the toil of error, and place it on the way to heaven.

Having finished our preliminaries we come to statements of doctrine. Our first assertion is, that to commit and to live habitually in grievous sin is a step toward atheism. Scripture teaches this truth. The Book of Proverbs declares that the wicked man when he is come into the depth of sin, contemneth (Prov. 18, v. 3). That is, as commentators expound the text, he will despise advice and advisers; he will set at naught all laws, human and divine, and contemn the blessed inhabitants of heaven up to God himself. Indeed all mortal sin is at once atheism and pantheism—atheism, because it rejects the true God with his commandments and laws; pantheism, because sin prefers self and other creatures to God, and deifies them as far as it can do so. This is one of the reasons why God's hatred for sin is so great. Writing to Timothy (1 Tim. i, v. 19), St. Paul says that some, rejecting a good conscience, have made shipwreck of their faith. By a good conscience is here meant a sinless life. Neglecting this, says St. John Chrysostom, these people lost their faith and became apostates, schismatics, heretics, and even atheists. A house full of the smoke of sin, says St. Clement of Rome, prevents those who dwell in it from seeing the Maker of all things. Clement of Alexandria asserts that the cause of men's ignorance of God is the bad life they lead.

Who that looks at the world, says St. Hilary, does not see that God exists? And yet it often happens that while truth compels

us to accept God, the allurements of vice induce us to say that there is no God.

The teachings of Scripture and of the saints are naturally enough supported by reason. Wicked men, who are not utterly dead to morality, are stung by sin. They wish to escape the penalty which they feel that God will exact for it. They cannot bear the clamors of conscience, were it only to sin more freely. But the troublesome avenger will not down; it is not so easy to hush God's voice. In his torture the sinner has recourse to doubt. Perhaps there is no God, and soon there is no God. In these matters abysses are subordinated; hence one soon leads to another. One of the most terrific penalties of sin is that this sin prepares the way for that sin, and so on to the end of the deadly list. Besides, frequent repetition of grievous sin amounts to frequent turning away from God. Every day, or oftener, we close our eyes to His divine light, and put away from us the help that He gives us against sin. Justly, therefore, God leaves us to ourselves and withdraws His efficacious grace. Thereupon the sinner constantly falls into worse sins, gives himself up to a reprobate sense, nay, to that worst of all sin, there is no God.

All grievous sin, then, paves the way to atheism. There are, however, certain kinds of sin that more especially foster the horrible vice. Among these is deservedly classed inordinate, intense love of wealth. Such desire imbeds the mind in the gross things of earth, materializes it, and renders it, to say the least, unscrupulous in the use of means. Once acquired and increased—no matter how illicitly—there grows up another furious desire to retain the ill-gotten hoard. There is no glue so sticky as unlawful money. It is almost as easy to wash the dusky sons of Nigritia white, as to wrench stolen money out of a man's hands. He *will* restore it; he can't do so *now*, he *needs* it for his family, etc. Firmly conscience sets its face against the deed; but the rebukes of conscience are met with the declaration: There is no God—for in this case it is desirable there should be none. Be quiet then, conscience. If there is a God at all, he does not mind what men do. He is a soft, good-natured God, full of mercy (minus justice), and will not harm us. The wisest and the richest of monarchs saw the dangers of wealth, and therefore he besought God not to give him wealth; and he added, as the reason of his prayer: Lest perhaps being filled, I should be tempted to deny, and say: "Who is the Lord?" (Prov. 30, v. 8-9). That is, who will take my wealth from me, or hinder me from using it as I please in gluttony and in lust?

St. Ambrose remarks that avarice is a near neighbor to treachery. Long before him St. Paul had said to Timothy (1 Tim. 6, v.



9-10): "They that will become rich fall into temptation and into the snare of the Devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which draw men into destruction and perdition. For the desire of money is the root of all evils; which some coveting have erred from the faith and entangled themselves in many sorrows." The miser does not believe that there is any God in the world to come, and, therefore, in this life he contemns faith and all religion. Nor is it only lust of lucre that slopes down into atheism. Sins of the flesh produce the same disastrous result. Nothing is more commonly inculcated than this truth by the doctors and saints of the Church. And the reason of the assertion lies on the very surface of things. Sins of this description plunge reason into flesh and blood; they blind its eyes and unfit it for the contemplation of divine truth. Christ himself assures us that a clean heart is necessary in order to see God; and the saying need not be wholly restricted to supernatural sight. The animal man does not perceive what is spiritual. St. Thomas counts thoughtlessness, mental blindness and hatred for God among the daughters of lust. Now the nature of hatred is not to see what is most obvious, or if it sees, it passes on, as though it saw not. Who, then, will gainsay that darkness of mind, depravity of the understanding, loss of right reason, inconsiderateness, hatred for God—which are all the offspring of lust—form, chiefly when combined, proximate dispositions for atheism?

Still another sin which puts a man on the down-hill to atheism, is intellectual pride. This form of pride makes one immoderately trust his own abilities and knowledge. For trivial reasons it prefers its own private views to the convictions and demonstrations even of the most learned. It is persuaded that there is no problem which it cannot grasp and thoroughly comprehend. The Holy Ghost tells us that pride is the beginning of all sin, and that the *beginning* of the pride of man is to fall off from God. (Eccl. 10, v. 15, 14.) Hence it would seem that the very first sin pride commits is to reject God, and go over to his enemies. Moreover, it is exceedingly difficult to prove to the intellectually proud anything which runs counter to their ideas. No matter how solid and conclusive your arguments, either they are not considered, or they are contemptuously put aside. They make little of what other men think. The argument in favor of God's existence drawn from the general consent of mankind has no weight in the balance, because what are all the men of past ages alongside of a modern scientist, for instance? Once rid of the human race, the transition to the rejection of all evidence for God is not at all so violent. These intellectual giants are of course daring thinkers; they are the boldest of the Japhetic race. They are fickle too and fond of

novelty. With iron tenacity they cleave to frivolous theories, because these theories are new and run foul of the doctrine generally received among the conservatively learned. The novelties and vapory fabrications are assailed and put to rout. Still the giants keep to their guns. Batter away at them as much as you please, they will not retire from the position that they have taken up. Logic, however, continues inexorable. The proud dogmatizers must be consequent, and concede unpleasant inferences. Therefore, the process goes on until the theorizers find themselves wedged in among the most uncomfortable errors. Like the impatient man of whom St. Austin speaks, they start by asserting that the teasing fly could not be from God, and they have to allow that even the elephant is not from God—nor the world—in fact, that there is no God at all.

Intellectual pride is the grand storehouse of objections against God; indeed without that resource atheism would not have much to say. Amid the blaze of their learning, the patrons of intellectual pride pretend that God's existence should not be accepted, or at least that it should be put on the shelf of doubt. And why so? Because the astronomer cannot see him through his telescope, nor the chemist find him in his old laboratory, or the great wit meet him at an evening party, or the geologist come upon him amid the wrecks of "days that are over." Because, say sour-tempered philosophers, socialists, communists, *we* cannot see how it is consistent with reason, etc., that a God, who is reported to be immeasurably wise, good, powerful, foreseeing, and so forth, should allow so many human beings to live without knowing him, and thus damn themselves for eternity. Why are the good in affliction and the wicked prosperous? Why is there so much evil in this world, etc., etc.? You don't see how all this is. Therefore there is nothing to be said about these points, and there is no God. If you saw something against them, your ideas would be worth attention. It is knowledge that should account for, prove or disprove propositions; not ignorance.

In his *Meditations*, Descartes remarks that all the difficulties raised by atheists come, either from their putting human passions in God, or from attempting, with their own narrow little minds, to determine and comprehend fully what God ought to be and to do. Is not this the central sin of multitudes in our own 19th century? Yet philosophers of high standing teach us that we cannot form a comprehensive idea of even the simplest object. At its beginning this world was made so perfect, from the lowest to the sublimest creature, that no man can take in all its beauty, order, unity, and perfection. Our knowledge is far more a learned ignorance, as *à Lapide* calls it, than a complete science. According to St. Thomas,

we cannot exhaust the intelligibility even of a fly. How silly, therefore, to pretend to fathom the infinitely infinite abysses of God! More reasonably might we strive to inclose Atlantic's waters within the palm of our right hand. Ignorance is a splendid reason for us to learn, or to hold our tongues; but it is no motive at all to dogmatize, or even to speak, unless we wish to show what fools we are, or to say an humble, I don't know.

The imperfections of our knowledge are very much to be insisted on among those who rashly fancy their minds to be the measure and *ultima thule* of everything. Such braggarts must learn not to be so highminded (Rom. xi. v. 20), and not to lose sight of their ignorance. The same conduct should be followed with the weak-minded folks, who, Wouter Van Twiller like, fall to doubting God's existence because they are unable to unfold his nature, or detect the ends which led him not to hinder this or that. Learn that your God is unlimited in every kind of perfection, and it is fortunate for us all that he is, otherwise he never could have tolerated our impudence so long. *Patiens quia æternus* is the explanation offered by St. Augustine. God bears with the multitude of our shortcomings, because he remains forever. He will meet us all at the portals of eternity. Meanwhile and forever he is incomprehensible by time, by space, by thought, and by love. Whatever we do about him falls short of him. His judgments cannot be fully understood, and his ways are far beyond the investigations of men.

The next step to atheism is furnished by the politicians. Nor need this excite wonder, for the world is Anti-Christ, and if anything is now the world, surely it is politics. Our author calls this step Machiavellism. What is that? Vasquez, Lessius, together with Machiavelli himself, define it to be a system, teaching that our chief care is to be given to what concerns the external management of the state and of our families, so as to keep the people in order and obedience, and to retain as well as increase family property. Religion, consequently, is to be valued and employed only so far forth as it promotes these ends. From this descriptive definition, it is plain Machiavellism, instead of being only one sin, is an entire crowd of sins; and indeed it involves religious hypocrisy; it prefers the creature to God; the prudence of the flesh to heavenly wisdom. It changes religion according to worldly circumstances, violates oaths, oppresses the innocent, and is ready to commit any crime whatever that may judged fit to secure and aggrandize the state. This theory is a flat contradiction of the precept of Christ in reference to seeking first the kingdom of heaven and its justice. It is statolatry—the State god—that total supremacy in practice and fact, which we witness ourselves, of the temporal over the

eternal. Manifestly this doctrine leads by quite a short-cut to atheism. It snaps its fingers at all religion, and sacrifices it every day for earthly gain. *Quid vultis mihi dare et ego tradam eum*, as the unprincipled Judas said. I am ready to betray Christ for any sum of money, for any position, honor, that you may see fit to bestow on me. I am willing to be a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, a Turk, a worshipper of idols, an atheist even, if that will forward my temporal interests. This code of morals, unfortunately, is not out of practice. Its action and consequences are daily before our eyes.

Grave impatience, under the many trials of life, will lead in the same direction as the sins which have been hitherto mentioned. For wise and lofty reasons God allows these crosses, and will not exempt us from them. Unless, therefore, we are resigned to the divine will, when under pressure, we shall break out into declarations against God's goodness and justice, and even question his existence. A certain intemperance of language, that arises from this impatience, from a fiery imagination, and habitually exaggerated use of words, or some other kindred cause, is not without its danger as regards disbelief of God. This defect indulges in such assertions as, that it is as sure as that God is in heaven, etc. Now it often happens that this wonderfully magnified certainty turns out to be no certainty at all, and people, seeing that what was so confidently and so solemnly asserted cannot be relied on, are exposed to suspect even the most evident truths. Hence our Lord recommends great moderation in speech, and St. Ignatius warns us against violent comparisons, as that such a one is as holy as St. Paul, and the like. The same evil will follow from frequenting the company of unbelievers, and from reading bad books, especially in the case of uneducated or half-educated persons. Long ago the Holy Ghost told us of this danger: Ps. xvii. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 33. In accordance with that teaching the Church prohibits bad books, and excommunicates the obstinate sinner. The same idea was at the bottom of that legislation which would not tolerate heresy in Spain and other countries. Many are altogether too tender towards errors in faith and reason. Forbearance is for the erring, not for error.

Irreverent talk, jesting about sacred things, ludicrous applications of Scripture, should also be avoided. The same can be said of representing religious ceremonies, the parodying of religion's ministers in theatres and at the opera. For as the reading of bad books is equivalent to bad conversation, so this trifling with, perhaps even mocking or jeering at sacred things, lessens respect for the divine and brings it into contempt. With the foregoing we must link fictitious miracles, pretended prophecies, fabricated

visions, trumped up stories about the saints, and the like. Sooner or later these impostures are brought to light, and then they cause the real marvels of religion to be suspected or disbelieved. We know how severe the Church is in judging supernatural occurrences and in canonizing her saints. Perhaps the most difficult concession to be obtained from the Holy See is the approbation of a miracle, or the raising of a holy person to the altars of the Church. Arguments that would pass in almost any other court, are mercilessly rejected in Rome. Hatred for the Religious and the ecclesiastical state in general, is the last dangerous step towards atheism that we shall mention under our first heading. That such hatred is a step towards atheism cannot be doubted. Ecclesiastics and Religious are the ministers of God. To despise them as such is therefore to despise God, who appointed them, and from contempt to total rejection the distance is short.

Some say that the clergy deserve this contempt because they are so bad. But if this reason is to hold, where shall we find contempt enough for the laity, since it is notorious that in their ranks multitudes are bad. Indeed—putting Church history aside—we must allow, for the sake of Protestantism and other heresies, that there have been bad clergymen and bad Religious. Without them where would the sects be? These bad people were the fostering fathers and nursing mothers of all Christian sects. Our sinners and cast-aways are their saints and progenitors. Whilst they were papists, said Luther, “they had only one devil in them, but so soon as they turned Protestants, every one of them had seven.” But, though we grant that there have been bad living priests and Religious, what vast numbers of them were incontestably holy, and the best friends of humanity! On account of the weakness of men, there will be in the Church, until the end of time, cockle and sound grain, excellent and worthless fishes, wise and foolish virgins. Wickedness was found even among the angels, and myriads of them were dragged from their high estate down to the bottom of hell. We must not despise the Church because of a few who are bad against her will and teaching. The net of the Lord should not be broken on account of a few bad fishes. *Some* offenders are not *all* offenders, unless the whole world is to insist on going to jail. Slanderers of spiritual persons commonly commit a fourfold sin, says St. Thomas. They exaggerate real evil; they present what is doubtful as certain; they invent falsehoods, and pervert the good.

But others will add that the Church is too rich, and that priests are forever hunting for money.

Much could be said in reply to this objection, were we to consider what those who are not priests do in order to procure dollars and cents. However, we shall let that side of the question alone. Who

has ever done for the Christian Church what David, Solomon, and other Jews did for the famous temple at Jerusalem? Giving money to churches is an old practice, and St. Paul ordains it. He took up collections, and bade those who serve the altar to live by it. What has not the heathen done for his idols and the Mohammedan for his prophet? The early Christians were profuse in their liberality to God's house, and God killed some people for hiding their goods from the Apostles. It is all very well to exclaim with the impious old poet:

"Dicite pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum!"

For may we not ask, what has gold to do with your body, your furniture, or the harness of your horses? What have the stars to do in the heavens, flowers in the fields, gems in the ocean? What has gold to do in churches? It does what you ought to do, it serves the Maker of all things; it enriches and beautifies his dwelling among men. Besides, the world has not left much gold in churches. An old sinner, in Sicily, once took a gold cloak from Jupiter, with the remark that it was too heavy in summer and too cold for winter. It is true that loftier motives impel modern robbers. They plunder in the name of law, liberty, and toleration. Their depredations, however, force the priest to seek money in order to build, to repair, and to support churches, for people must have them. If you are scandalized at priests asking for money, give it without being asked. You are free to endow churches, schools, colleges, hospitals, asylums, etc., for which, Sunday after Sunday, the priest has to go through the drudgery of begging for money. Give the money, and you will get what you need, far more, the sturdy preaching of the Gospel. If the priest does not beg, nothing can be originated or kept up in a parish; people will say he has no life, no zeal in him. The priest, too, has a man's nature about him, and he cannot live on the four winds or the Holy Ghost alone. Very often this talk about money-making priests, is indulged in chiefly by those, who have a wonderfully cheap way of serving God. What would these tender consciences do were they under the Jewish law, that gave so largely to priests and Levites? If anything, the priests of the New Law are more perfect, higher in dignity, and consequently they ought to receive more. Remember, though, that the eating of Church property is among the deadliest of poisons, for states as well as for individuals.

And here ends our first part. What remains to be said is far shorter.

Our second member asserts that heresy is a highroad to atheism.

At first heresy meant the adoption of a doctrine, whether true

or false. At present, its common meaning is the choice of an erroneous doctrine in religion, or that wrong doctrine itself. It is defined as a wilful and obstinate error in matters regarding the Catholic faith, in one professing to be a Christian. From this definition heresy plainly opens a wide avenue to atheism. Being an error it can afford no objective certainty. It is founded on private judgment, and in religious matters particularly, that is a copious source of falsehood. It gives the lie to God and to his messenger. It pretends to know revelation without its sole accredited witness, the Catholic Church. But let us descend to special heresies. The one which teaches that salvation is attainable in any Christian sect, is unquestionably a gate to atheism. For it must advocate every absurdity on account of the hundreds of conflicting religions; and if an absurd religion does not beget scorn for all religion and for God himself, what can do so? Among other enormities, Calvinism makes God far more the author of sin than any sinning man, even than the Devil himself is; since God is the chief and independent absolute agent in every act. It says likewise that God foreordains some to hell, and commands what is impossible for man. Surely such doctrine is atheistic. Luther taught the above-mentioned errors of Calvin as well as a host of others. He absolved men from the necessity of good works. Therefore Luther too is favorable to atheism. And what is true of these heresies is applicable to all others, at least in so far as they reject God's authority. Thus we close our second part.

The third part of our division is concerned with erroneous views in the field of philosophy, whether mental or moral. It can also take in unsound opinions in theology. The first that we have here to put in line is, that noted raider on philosophy, named Descartes. This man had a doubt, which he called methodic, because, perhaps, there was method in his madness. At all events he said, that to begin philosophy, which, if anything at all is, we suppose, the certain and harmonious knowledge of truth—we should place ourselves in a state of universal doubt about all things. Then our minds would be free from prejudices, and ready for ethereal truth. But if that doubt is accepted, it must apply to God, since according to some, belief in him is a terrible prejudice. Descartes also says, "that God can cause two and two not to be four, or change the essence of things." He slights the arguments advanced by theologians and philosophers in proof of God's existence, and loftily replaces them by some of his own excogitating, which he considers more certain than any demonstration in geometry. Our old book thus photographs Descartes. He was a soldier, and gave up the army to become a philosopher. He knew nothing except some mathematics; nor was he a man of much judgment. His

acquaintance with logic was slight, and in philosophy he had not advanced far. He was fonder of novelty than of truth, and cared more for a widespread name than for a good one. He entertained a grand opinion of himself, and affected moderation in everything. Yet the fires of his inborn pride broke out whenever he met with opposition. He was not always consistent in stating, or in supporting his views.

Descartes has had the misfortune to draw upon himself the panegyrics of heretics. It was his sad privilege to devastate in philosophy every department that he entered. He treated logic, and he ruined it by his methodic doubt. He meddled with Critica, and he shattered its principles by his subjective evidence. He entered ontology, and he shook its foundations by making the essences of things depend on the free-will of God. He ventured on cosmology, and annihilated corporeal substance by allowing it nothing beyond its threefold dimensions. He dealt with physics, and he stripped it of all beauty and variety, by reducing everything within its domains to pure motion and matter. He introduced into ideology the false theory of innate ideas. He nullified the human compound by lowering the soul to the mere office of mover to the body. He disturbed the fundamental idea of psychology by representing the soul as only a simple unextended being.—*Civiltà Cattolica*, July 5th, 1862, p. 40. Still, this intellectual rioting has not prevented Descartes' trumpeters from blaring him out as the creator of philosophical science and the first man that ever demonstrated the spirituality of the soul. O, poor human brains! What mental aberrations have been witnessed since the scholastic philosophy was driven from the schools. But Descartes and Malebranche are gradually sinking to the low level which they should always have occupied.

Another open road to atheism, is the denial of the soul's immortality. Irreligion under every form and moral filth can then follow. The attributes of God are destroyed, because there is no fitting reward for virtue or vices. God, who has taught the immortality of the soul, is made a liar, and therefore, he is no God. Would the soul be intellectual, could she know God at all, were she purely mortal?

The theory so common, even in our own day, that people can lawfully believe as they please, and go from one religion to another at will, is evidently atheistic. Even Beza himself said, that such freedom of conscience was only leave granted to all men to go to hell; that it was a doctrine of Satan, a liberty of the Devil. Whoso permits God to be blasphemed, really acknowledges and loves no God. If he did, he would defend his God and his Church. He would not tolerate the enemies of God, nor make laws to have Him blasphemed.



But we must end our enumeration of the steps to atheism. Every one will confess that the steps mentioned issue in atheism. These steps show that at its origin, atheism is not quite so respectable as some would have us believe. It is not the child of pure intellect and science. On the contrary, in a multitude of instances, its parentage is low and disreputable. A sot, a libertine, a rebel to reason, truth, faith, can be an atheist; never a man of reason or of faith. There is, therefore, in atheism, nothing to be proud of. A witty French lady said, to a would-be gentleman, who in her presence paraded his ungodliness, "You are not alone, sir, in your way of thinking; my dog is also an atheist."

As long as reason remains no one can prove that there is no God. Hence, according to Scripture, it is only the fool that can say there is no God, and even if he says so, he says it in his *heart*, not in his *head* or *mind*, for the mind of itself can never come to that degree of madness. There are, indeed, many moral atheists, that is to say, men who without any reason, and solely from passion, from the desire that there should be no God, say there is no God. Hence a good confession is often the greatest destroyer of atheism. And it is a thing those afflicted with should hastily put away from them. It can lead only to hell, though even there the doctrine is not fashionable.

Should any one, who chances to read these pages, have taken any of the foregoing steps, let him withdraw on the instant. The grandest honor for man on this earth, or anywhere else, is to believe, love, and serve God.

---

## THE PURSUIT OF "JOSEPH."

LATE in the fall of 1876 a band of the Nez Percé Indians, on their way from their homes west of the mountains to the "Buffalo country," stopped for a day or two at the post of Fort Shaw. The various bands inhabiting the western part of Montana and Eastern Idaho have been accustomed, for many years, to make this trip for procuring supplies of buffalo meat. Coming east in the fall, they remain amongst the buffalo during the winter, and return to the west in the spring. This visit was, therefore, no novelty to the garrison of Fort Shaw, and derived its interest from future events, for the Chief of the band was the since celebrated "*Looking Glass*."

The chiefs called upon the commanding officer, as usual, were kindly received and supplied with some necessary provisions, which, singular to say, they never *asked* for, but always took. They were invited to give us an exhibition of a *sham* battle. To this they consented, and, at the hour appointed, the whole garrison turned out, when the distant shots and loud yells of the warriors were heard as they approached the post from their camp down the river. Firing their pieces in the air and uttering their peculiar yells, they approached the post in a motley crowd, their horses prancing, their drums beating and their gay, painted feathers fluttering in the breeze. After marching in this fashion entirely around the garrison, to show off their gay trappings and hideously painted faces, they assembled for the fight on the prairie outside the post. Dividing into two parties, they went through the manoeuvres of a supposed conflict, charging and firing at each other, advancing and retreating, tumbling from their horses to simulate the killed and wounded, and now and then dismounting to fight on foot, when they jumped about like so many capering monkeys, all the time uttering the most frightful yells. The whole thing was looked upon by the spectators as a most ridiculous farce, and the remark was frequently heard, "If they do not fight better than that when they get into a real battle, they will not do much harm to the enemy." Many of those looking on, had occasion afterwards to recall this reflection, and an incident of the sham battle, regarded as peculiarly farcical at the time, was strongly impressed upon our minds by after events. During a pause in the conflict, the half-breed interpreter approached me and asked for some *rags*. On inquiring as to what he wanted with them, he said "to make a fire." I suggested a handful of hay. This was obtained, and when the battle recommenced, an Indian, crawling up towards the opposition

party, deposited his hay, and with a match set it on fire. The wind being favorable, the smoke was carried into the faces of the enemy, and behind it the now victorious party charged forward with loud yells, and drove their enemy from the field in wild confusion, and thus ended the fight. This incident, derisively looked upon as child's play at the time, many of us had occasion afterwards to recall under more serious circumstances.

In the following June, reports began to reach us of hostilities having broken out among the Nez Percés, west of the mountains. The region where the first conflicts between the troops and the Indians took place, is not only west of the main divide of the Rocky Mountains, but west of the Bitter Root range, a high, rugged range, running north and south, over which passes, for nearly one hundred miles, a rough, difficult mountain trail, known as the "Lon Lon" pass, the trail entering the Bitter Root valley a few miles above the town of Missoula, Montana Territory. The difficulties of the trail are graphically described in the journal of Lewis and Clarke, who passed over it seventy-one years ago, and named the stream issuing from it to the eastward, "Traveller's Rest Creek;" for here their expedition rested one day before encountering the perils of the trail, after their trip down the *Bitter Root*, by them named Clarke's River.

Early in June two small companies of infantry had been sent from Fort Shaw, to establish a post near the town of Missoula, and between that place and the mouth of "Traveller's Rest Creek," or Lon Lon Fork. This was the only post in Western Montana, and the nearest one to the scene of hostilities.

To meet any emergency in Montana, the number of troops available was very small, for all the cavalry, comprising one half the strength in the Territory, had early in the spring been ordered for service down the Yellowstone River. This left for our sole dependence ten companies of infantry, occupying five different posts and scattered for a distance, north and south, of some 250 miles, with the outlying post near Missoula, nearly that distance to the westward.

On the first report that the hostiles were moving eastward, one company was hastily dispatched in wagons from Fort Ellis, and after a rapid march, reached Missoula, but not until after the Indians had succeeded in passing into the Bitter Root valley. This took away every available soldier from Fort Ellis, and immediately afterwards, on the receipt of positive intelligence that the Nez Percés were moving over the Lon Lon trail, a concentration of troops at Fort Shaw from the posts of Fort Benton and Camp Baker was ordered. This concentration was effected on the 27th of July, and the following day the little force, consisting of seven

officers and seventy-six men, filed out of Fort Shaw, followed by its pack-mules, and took up its march for Missoula, 150 miles distant. As we were to march via Cadotte's Pass, and now knew its location (see last paper) we were able to strike for it in a "bee line," which in a country like this, intersected with hills and valleys, is not quite as straight as the "crow flies." Our mules, unaccustomed to packing, gave a good deal of trouble, and no one knows, except after trial, what trouble an obstinate mule *can* give under the pack or *over* it, when he puts his whole mind to it. In consequence, the first day's march was short. Several of the mules, apparently coming to the conclusion that they preferred a comfortable stable and plenty of grain at Fort Shaw, to a life in the open air and scant grass, after scattering their loads of bacon and hard tack over the prairie, galloped back to the post, and it was past midnight before they were recaptured and taken back to camp.

It was late the next day before we reached the Dearborn River, twenty-five miles distant. Here we nooned for three hours, feasting on delicious fresh trout caught from the bright, clear, cold stream, and then resumed the march towards the mountains, following the trail leading towards Cadotte's Pass. As the shadows of approaching sunset commenced to fall across our path, we bivouacked for the night well up towards the mountains, having dispatched our little party of mounted men across the summit as an advance guard; for it was desirable to get ahead as rapidly as possible. The route up the Big Blackfoot (the Cokalahishkit of Lewis and Clarke) from Missoula and through Cadotte's Pass was the shortest and usual route followed by the Indians coming across the mountains, and if these hostiles succeeded in eluding or overpowering the small force near Missoula they would in all probability meet us somewhere on this trail. Our force being so small it was a matter of some importance that we should have early intelligence of their approach, and a choice of position to resist them.

The next morning we resumed the march, gradually rising as the trail entered the mountains, until we reached the foot of the steep hill which led up to the summit, where we encountered the snow-storm six years ago in our trip from the west, and at length, after a steep climb of a mile or more stood again upon the summit of the Rocky Mountains. There had been a slight rain the night before and the day was cold and cloudy, so that we felt but little disposition to stay and enjoy the view which opened out to the eastward. We quickly descended the slope on the other side and halted to rest and lunch at a little clear stream, which trickled from the mountain-side towards its long voyage to the great Columbia. Our route now lies down a pretty but narrow little

valley, shut in by dense masses of timber, which cover the hills on every side to their very summits. We noon, shortly after striking the main Blackfoot, which comes out of a deep gorge from the south, and simply out of curiosity, but with no hope of catching anything, I put my rod together and cast a fly upon the glassy surface of a deep pool close by our stopping-place. It has scarcely touched the water before, with a rush and a splash, a good-sized trout breaks the surface, seizes it, and is landed after a short struggle, a speckled beauty, on the grass; an ample "string" soon rewards a short walk along the stream. During the day we had started up along the trail numerous coveys of the beautiful blue or mountain grouse, the young of which is now just fit for the table; and, with plenty of these, and fresh trout just from the water, we had no cause to complain either of the quality or quantity of our noonday meal.

We pushed ahead in the afternoon, being anxious to get beyond the junction of our trail with that through Lewis and Clarke's Pass lest the Indians, if on the road, should give us the slip by that route. The valley now begins to widen out more, and in search of grouse I wander from the main trail with shot-gun in hand and followed by an orderly carrying a rifle. I have just passed a little grove of green quaking asp, and am thinking of nothing in particular, when casting my eyes to the left they encountered a sight which caused me instantly to check my horse and grasp my gun. There, not fifty yards away, lies a fine young white-tailed buck, his thick velvety horns turned directly towards me and his great eyes staring as if questioning my right to intrude on his solitude. Strange to say, he makes no effort to rise, but lies there in his noonday bed looking at me. Quickly unlocking my breech-loader I slip out the small shot cartridges, and seize a buckshot wire cartridge, several of which I always carry in my belt; but it is somewhat worn, and in my feverish attempt to force it in it gets jammed and the block refuses to close. I fear some sort of exclamation must have escaped me, for the deer not liking the look of affairs slowly rose to his feet and stalked off, the most beautiful and graceful animal I ever looked upon. Hastily jumping from my horse, and dropping my gun on the ground, I ran back a few paces to the orderly, took my rifle from him, slipped in a cartridge, and hastened back to my former position, just in time to catch sight of the deer slowly moving through the timber, and not yet aware of the fact that he was treading upon dangerous ground. A sharp crack of the rifle echoed through the woods, there was a hurried rush and a plunge, and the magnificent fat buck fell, almost at the feet of my orderly, shot through the heart. That night our bill of fare had broiled venison steaks added to it.

We passed the trail leading into Lewis and Clarke's Pass without seeing any sign of Indians, and followed down the now enlarged Blackfoot through a wide open valley, dotted here and there with groves of magnificent pine trees towering a hundred feet above our heads. We bivouacked in one of these late in the afternoon, and in the midst of a heavy rain, which continued during the night, soaking everything thoroughly, and sadly interfering with sleep. The stream is literally filled with fine large trout, and enough were obtained to supply the wants of the whole command.

The next day opened with rain, but it soon cleared off, and the men having now got on their marching legs, moved along at a rapid gait, passing Lincoln Gulch, a mining settlement, and entering the narrow cañon of the Blackfoot below. Here I received a courier from Helena with news from Missoula, that the Nez Percés, finding Captain Rawn's little force entrenched in the cañon of the Lon Lon Fork, had displayed a force in his front, and then with their main body marched around his position over the hills, out of range of his rifles, and entered the valley of the Bitter Root in his rear. There was great excitement in the settlements, and much apprehension of an approaching conflict, but a later dispatch received from Captain Rawn informed me that the citizens who had accompanied him as volunteers to the Lon Lon Pass had returned home, after making an agreement with the Indians that their lives and property should be safe. The Nez Percés had then moved up the Bitter Root valley away from the direction of Missoula.

The important question now with us was, which way were they going? Knowing that their natural route lay along the one we were travelling, I rather anticipated they would move *down* the Bitter Root and up this trail, but I knew also that they would never enter on such a mountain pass incumbered with their women, children, and herds, without thoroughly scouting ahead to see that the coast was clear. When, therefore, the soldier who brought me the dispatch from Captain Rawn stated that he had met on the trail, and travelled with for some miles, nine armed Indians, who told him they were Nez Percés, and were going across the country to join Joseph's band on the Bitter Root, he telling them that he was coming up the trail to meet me, I felt well assured they would not bring their camp by this route, unless, pressed by General Howard from the rear, they should feel themselves compelled to attack my small force to clear the road in front of them. Hence we pushed ahead more rapidly than ever, and after leaving the cañon camped in the open prairie on the borders of a beautiful lake, having marched twenty-seven miles.

The following day, August 1st, we continued the march through a high, rolling, open prairie, filled with little streams and lakes, and

dotted all over with little rounded knolls or knobs, and as I rose a prominent hill, a light suddenly dawned upon me. As far as the eye could reach in every direction, and bounded only by the wooded hills which bordered the prairie, the surface was one continued series of *knobs*; and I then recalled the description given by Captain Lewis: "From the multitude of knobs irregularly scattered through this country, Captain Lewis called it the Prairie of the Knobs." There could be no question about it. This was the spot referred to, and in fancying that I had discovered in the expedition six years ago,<sup>1</sup> the place so named by Captain Lewis, I was in error. For hours we travelled through this plain landmark, so aptly named by Captain Clarke, and nooned at the mouth of a fine large stream, which he calls the North Fork of the Cokalahashkit, and up which a trail leads to the head of Jocko valley, where is located the agency for the Flathead Indians. Our route now, for some distance, lies over some very steep, thickly wooded hills, where our animals labor a good deal on the steep ascents and amidst the thickly fallen timber. The day's march was very hot and tedious, and it was nearly sundown before we halted for the night, after making only twenty-four miles. Here I received another dispatch from Captain Rawn, dated that morning, and informing me that the Indians were moving very slowly up the Bitter Root valley. They are evidently in no hurry to leave, and I think are quietly waiting to see what the troops are going to do, and they will have ample notice, for their scouts are out in every direction, and they are informed of everything that occurs in the valley, and even what the white people themselves know. Captain Rawn also sends me a dispatch, just received from General Howard, and dated July 25th. The General states that he will start in pursuit from Kamisch five days afterwards (the 30th). These are five precious days, and the Indians have already made their escape from the pass before the pursuers have entered it. From what I learned afterwards in the Bitter Root valley, the Indians were fully aware of their danger, and of the necessity for haste to get out of the pass, for a number of them, in their free talks with the settlers, said with an air of triumph, "We have got you scared now; a few days ago you had us scared," alluding to when they were in the pass, with Captain Rawn entrenched before them, and, as they thought, General Howard coming up behind them.

The next day, August 2d, we made an early start, and leaving the infantry to follow, I hastened ahead toward Missoula, reported to be fifty miles distant. The trail now once again left the open country, and entered a gorge of the mountains, the scenery becom-

---

<sup>1</sup> See preceding paper.

ing wilder and more grand at every step. For miles we were compelled to climb and descend steep mountain-sides on a trail just wide enough for the passage of a single animal, and rendered in places hazardous from loose stones or fallen timber, which sadly tried the strength of our pack-mules and weary horses. The Blackfoot, now a considerable stream, tumbles along hundreds of feet beneath us, whilst on every side mountain peaks tower above our heads. In many places the slopes are so steep that all are compelled to dismount and lead the horses. We stop for an hour to rest and graze our weary animals, and then push ahead again, and near 12 o'clock, when about to stop for a nooning, meet another courier from Captain Rawn, saying the Indians are still in the valley, moving very slowly southward, and evidently watching the whole valley with their scouts. On the report of the courier, that Missoula was only five miles distant, I concluded to push ahead without stopping. But the trail had become still more rough and difficult; we are obliged to travel slowly, and rejoice when we emerge from the mountains and look down upon a level plateau which marks the junction of the Blackfoot with the Hell Gate River, or according to Lewis and Clarke (whose baptismal names should be retained), the forks of the Eastern Fork of Clarke's River and the Cokalashashkit. For the first time since leaving Lincoln Gulch, we see a house, and a ride of a mile or two through a valley, dotted with farm-houses and grain-fields, where the harvesters are at work, brings us to the little town of Missoula, pleasantly situated on a bright, clear stream, which empties into the Hell Gate, close to the town. After a short halt to get the news, we pass on to the post, which we reach late in the afternoon, after a hard ride of over fifty miles. Lieutenant Bradley, with his mounted party, got in before sundown, and we only awaited the arrival of the infantry, to take up our line of march up the Bitter Root valley. By sending wagons out to the point where the trail emerges from the mountains, the tired infantrymen reached the post at 4 P.M. of the 3d.

Immediately on my arrival I sent a messenger to Charlo, the chief of a band of Flatheads, living up the valley of the Bitter Root, inviting him to come and see me. He arrived the next morning, and through an interpreter I opened the talk with him, by stating that the whole valley was filled with Nez Percé scouts, who were acting as spies, that he and his people were the only ones who knew these Indians and could distinguish them from friendly Indians, and that I wanted his young warriors to go out, capture these spies, and bring them in to me as prisoners. Charlo is a quiet, pleasant-faced Indian, and had very little to say. What he did say, however, was to the point, and to the effect that he and his people were friends to the whites, but that in the present struggle



between them and the Nez Percés he could not take sides, and firmly declined to do what I wished. He left the next morning for his camp near Stevensville, and I was obliged to commence the movement up the valley, fearing that the first step we took would be observed by the Nez Percé scouts and promptly reported to their chief. Hoping, however, that there were more of them in the lower part of the valley, and that I might gain one day on them, the command was not started from the post until one o'clock P.M., when, with every man to be spared from the post, the whole loaded in wagons, we pulled out on the road. Crossing the Bitter Root (Clarke's) River on a bridge and moving up the west bank over a good road, we passed the mouth of the Lon Lon Fork, where seventy years ago the Lewis and Clarke expedition rested for a day or two on "Traveller's Rest Creek," and then separated into two parties, the one under Captain Lewis to follow the route we had just passed over, the other under Captain Clarke to pursue that we were about to follow, and to rejoin each other on the Great Missouri River below the mouth of the Yellowstone.

The march was continued far into the night, and it was nearly eleven o'clock before the command reached its halting-place near Stevensville, about twenty-seven miles distant. It was long after dark when I reached there considerably ahead of the command, after passing Fort Owens, a stockade, inside of which were huddled a promiscuous crowd of men, women, and children, who in fear and trembling had sought safety there from anticipated hostilities. The arrival of the soldiers was a great relief to these poor people, and at the same time created a great excitement. As we rode into Stevensville the loud barking of the dogs brought out all the inhabitants still remaining in the place. The town is located at the mouth of the "Scattering Creek" of Lewis and Clarke, and near it is a Catholic mission, to which one of the citizens offered to guide me in the dark. This man proved to be a discharged soldier from my regiment, and was afterwards of great service in guiding us to the Nez Percé camp. On reaching the Mission, surrounded by the teepees of Charlo's band of the Flatheads, I was hospitably received by the priest in charge, and sat in his room till the arrival of the command. The head priest of the mission, Father R., had been confined for a long time previous to his bed by illness, from which he was not yet recovered. His reputation as a successful *physician* was widespread, and having heard so much of him I was glad to receive an invitation to visit him in his chamber. Following the attending priest through an adjacent room I was introduced into one beyond, barely large enough to contain a small bed, a table, and a chair. Here, propped up in the bed, and *reading medicine* by the light of a dim lamp, was a charming old Frenchman, who with a

skull-cap on his head and a pair of glasses on his nose, received me with all the graceful cordiality of a past age, which his thirty-five years' residence in the wilderness had failed to obliterate. I was much attracted by the charms of his conversation, and sat talking to him for some time. He informed me that he had come to this country with the celebrated Father De Smet thirty-five years ago, and whilst wondering in my worldly way whether he had not probably gotten about tired of it he said, evidently with the utmost sincerity, "I thank God I shall in time lay my bones amongst these poor Indians." I did not say so to this good priest, but I could not help reflecting how different, under the present circumstances, my ambition was from his.

He gave me a great deal of information in regard to the Nez Percés, who had remained in this vicinity for some days, frequently visiting the town and freely trading with the inhabitants. In the course of conversation he asked me "how many troops I had." Now my experience with human nature, whether embodied in the form of soldiers or not, teaches me that there is a great indisposition to confess one's *weakness*, even when the confessor is a priest, and so I answered in a general way, "About two hundred." "Ah," said the old man, "you *must* not attack them, you have not enough. They are bad Indians, they are splendid shots, are well armed, have plenty of ammunition, and have at least two hundred and sixty warriors." I wonder what that brave old priest, who had voluntarily submitted to so long a banishment in the wilderness, would have said had I told him that "our duty might require some of us at least to *lay our bones amongst these poor Indians*." I parted with this charming old gentleman with much regret, and shall probably never see him again, but I can never forget the grace of his manner, which was so strongly contrasted by his surroundings, his solicitude for our welfare and safety, and his urgent invitation to call upon him when I came back.

Our camp that night was a sorry one. Very little wood was to be had, the camp-ground was bare of vegetation and dusty, and we went supperless to bed, our animals not much better off than we were, for although allowed to wander forth at large during the night they found scant means of gratifying their hunger in the bare waste which surrounded us. The night was cold, and the next morning, although the camp was astir early, we did not start till 6.30, and before leaving had free communication with some of the citizens, who came to our camp, and we thus picked up a good many items in regard to the Nez Percés.

We were told that during their presence in the vicinity they freely traded with the whites for provisions of all kinds, offering in exchange good prices in gold coin, dust, and greenbacks, which

the whites did not trouble themselves to reflect were stained with the blood of the peaceful settlers of a neighboring Territory. One scoundrel who visited our camp, I was told, boastfully claimed to have made a profit of \$500, in gold, in his trade with this band of murderers and thieves! They also traded off a number of horses and mules captured from our troops in Idaho and stolen from the settlers there, whilst watches and jewelry of different kinds were sold at fabulously low prices. It was even hinted that metallic ammunition was one of the items traded by the whites for these ill-gotten gains.

Some of the people complained bitterly of the action of a self-constituted committee, which it was said had taken upon itself the powers of a vigilance committee, and adopted a resolution that should any white man be charged with an offence against an Indian, he should at once be turned over to the Indians for punishment! We were also informed that when the Nez Percés first came up the valley, many of the inhabitants flocked with their goods to the inclosure at Fort Owens, where a considerable number still remained huddled together as I have mentioned. On the report, however, that the Indians were disposed to be peaceful, and that a brisk trade had been opened with them, goods were hurriedly loaded into wagons at Fort Owens and pushed forward to the scene of traffic, the owners being anxious not to lose the advantages of this new and unexpected market. Whether or not these reports were all true to the disgraceful extent we heard we had no time to ascertain, but the next day brought us into a moral atmosphere of a more healthy tone.

We resumed our trip up the valley, now well settled up with ranches and farms, though far from being as rich and productive as we had been led to expect. At the little town of Corvallis we stopped to noon and gather further news of the Indians, who generally had up to this time committed very few depredations and spilled no blood. The poor women and children were here found gathered behind the protecting walls of a well-built sod fort, which the hostiles had looked at and commented upon as they passed, evidently pleased at the scare they had created, and comparing it with their own scare when shut in the Lon Lon cañon. Parties of them had visited the town and attempted to trade at the stores, but their reception was in marked contrast to that met with lower down the valley. A Mr. Young, who kept a store in the place, met their advances to trade with a flat refusal, closed his doors and told the Indians plainly that their money was blood-stained and he wanted none of it. They were very saucy, and threatened to burn down his house, but the brave old man stood firm and dared them to do their worst. Although some of the more desperate ones

urged extreme measures, they were dissuaded by the more moderate, and the old hero was left master of the field, with the proud satisfaction of knowing his conscience was clear though at the expense of his pocket. After crossing the Bitter Root again, at a ford, we encamped on its bank about sundown, having made about thirty miles. Here we were joined by six citizens, who volunteered to accompany us. Amongst the number was Mr. Joe Blodget, who lived in the immediate neighborhood, was well acquainted with the upper valley, and had been recommended to me as the best guide in the country. He fully came up to his reputation, and proved of inestimable value to the expedition. To his frontier qualities as a good shot and a fine hunter, was added an intimate knowledge of every part of the trail up the valley and across the main divide of the Rocky Mountains into the Big Hole Basin. My first question to him was, "How far can we take our wagons?" to which he replied, "All the way through to Bannock, if you want to." I looked at him in astonishment, for I had been informed positively that beyond a certain point wagons could not go, and had, therefore, brought along our pack-saddles, intending when the time came to cut loose from the wagons and take to our pack-mules. I asked him if he was sure of what he said. When I became better acquainted with "Joe" Blodget, I never found it necessary to ask him that question in reference to any assertion he made regarding the country we were passing through. He assured me that although the trail was rough and steep in places, he had himself brought lightly loaded wagons all the way over the divide from Bannock. With this assurance we made an early start the next morning, and pushed ahead up the valley, following directly on the trail of the Indians, who on their march up had kept their main camp and herd on the west bank of the river. The trail was plainly marked and very large, showing the presence of a great number of animals, but no indication of either lodge-poles or the poles of "travois," on which Indians are accustomed to carry their wounded. The camps through which we passed during the day and the two following ones showed that the poles used for the teepees, and left standing in the camps, were collected each day for temporary use, and were not carried along on the march, the Indians being thus able to move much more lightly.

Our road continued good, although we crossed several large tributary streams coming in from the west, and forded the main stream three times, and it was one o'clock before we reached Lockwood's ranch, the last house up the Bitter Root valley. Here we stopped to noon, get dinner, and rest and graze our animals. Mr. Lockwood, the owner of the ranche, was with us, having with his family left his home, and sought safety in one of the forts lower

down the valley. On now returning to it he had occasion to recognize the futility of the truce between the Indians and the inhabitants of the Bitter Root valley. His house inside was a perfect wreck. Trunks were broken open and their contents scattered about, whilst furniture, crockery, and everything perishable was broken up and strewed over the place in every direction. The Indians appear to have been kept under very good control whilst in the lower valley, and I presume this mischief was done by some straggling party, or possibly by the rear guard, who may have felt unable to resist the inclination, just as they were leaving, of giving the white man a specimen of their vindictiveness. Blodget tells me that they paid his place a visit and carried off a number of things, including a favorite *coffee-pot*, which he was "bound to get back or its equivalent." Some of the citizens who accompanied us have been scouting ahead, and report that at nine o'clock this morning the Indians were in Ross's Hole, a distance of one day's march ahead of us. Feeling sure that the chiefs were kept fully advised by their scouts of every step we took, my hopes of getting a blow at them were very remote, unless by speedy movements and a surprise; the character of the country ahead being such as would prevent my column from being seen at any great distance. When I found, however, that they were not increasing their speed at all, and seldom marched more than twelve miles a day, the question of overtaking them by marching double that distance was simply one of time, provided we remained undiscovered, and these relative distances remained the same.

The trail of the Indians still continued up the bank of the river, and a short distance above Lockwood's ranche, the smoke of their old camp-fire, probably two nights old, was seen. Just at this point what is known as the southern Nez Percé trail came in from the west, and it was possible that by this trail the Indians may have received some accession to their number from straggling bands coming from the Clearwater country. As the camps in front of us had now passed this trail, it was evident the Indians had no intention, as was at one time feared, of returning by it to Idaho.

This point of the trail is of interest from the fact that here, on the 4th of September, 1806, the Lewis and Clarke expedition first struck the valley of the Bitter Root, the river being named after Captain Clarke, "he," says the *Journal*, "being the first white man who had ever visited its waters." The *Journal* describes the first meeting with the Indians of this valley, who were undoubtedly Flatheads, and whose descendants still occupy it. Victor, the father of the present chief, Charlo, lived until only a few years ago, and was present at this meeting of Lewis and Clarke. From "Joe" Blodget, who knew him well, I received many interesting reminiscences of the,

to the Indians, important event. He says that Victor had often described to him this first meeting with white men, and how from their pale faces they supposed they were *cold*, and covered them with robes.<sup>1</sup> He also told a story which I suspect had a more modern origin, as I do not think friction-matches had at that day been invented. The story goes that one of the white men whilst in the council took a little piece of wood from his pocket and scratching it upon a stone a flame burst forth, much to the amazement of the Indians, who immediately pronounced the white man "great medicine." Apocryphal or not, the incident may well serve to illustrate how the ignorance of a primitive mind would readily attribute to some supernatural cause a thing so simple to us as the ignition of a friction-match.

In imitation of Captain Clarke, we are now, instead of turning into this trail to the west, going to keep on up the Bitter Root, as he did on his way back the next year, and cross the main divide of the Rocky Mountains into the Big Hole Basin, this route being shorter and much better, Captain Clarke says, "than that by which we had advanced in the fall;" to which I add, the Lord help the *other* route!

We were now compelled to cease following the Indian trail, and take our wagons over a formidable ridge, which rose to the eastward of us, its top crowned with dense forests of pine. Shortly after three o'clock we left the river bottom and commenced to pull up a long steep incline, and the farther we went the longer and steeper it appeared to become. Slowly and laboriously we toiled our way up foot by foot, and at length stood upon the crest of a hill fully a mile long, only to find other hills almost as formidable rising up on the road ahead of us. If you want to know how to try the most amiable of tempers (if you are blessed with such), place yourself in a position where haste is of the utmost importance and where also you find yourself utterly unable to make *any* thing move faster than a sloth. You may possibly be able to fancy how trying is such a position to a temper not the most amiable in the world. However, there was nothing to do but to follow the example of the ant and keep on toiling, which we did, rising hill after hill until we thought it high time that we were approaching the top. But on expressing some such opinion to Joe, he pointed to a *mountain* which rose far above our heads to the right, and said in his quiet way: "The trail goes right over the top of that." We had now passed beyond the timber-line and continued to pull up hill after hill, the trail being in places so obscure that without the assistance of a guide

---

<sup>1</sup> This incident is mentioned in the Journal.

who knew its location it would have been utterly out of the question to follow it even with the speed we did. The sun was now rapidly approaching the snow-clad mountains in the west, and from our guide's description of the road ahead of us it soon became apparent that we would not be able to reach the summit that night, much less descend the slope on the other side as we had hoped. The disappointment, great as it was, did not prevent us from viewing with delight the magnificent scene spread out before us. From the ridge we stood upon, which appeared to be almost on a level with the snow-covered mountains opposite to us on the other side of the valley, the eye could trace down the valley of the Bitter Root the trail upon which we had come, and little clouds of dust at intervals along it showed us where parties of horsemen, volunteers from the valley, were hastening forward to join us. Beyond the valley heavily wooded mountain peaks towered one above the other, culminating in one whose rocky gorges, bare of timber, were filled with immense glaciers, the smooth glassy surfaces of which glistened in the rays of the setting sun, presenting to the eye an Arctic scene in strong contrast with that which immediately surrounded us. On the other side of us, stretching eastward as far as the eye could reach, was one continuous mass of timbered hills, with one isolated bare peak rising above the whole, in the direction of, and near, our guide says, the town of Deer Lodge, sixty or seventy miles away as the crow flies.

Impatient at our slow progress I rode ahead some distance to see what the prospect was, and after winding about through the thick timber and climbing several formidable hills, I reached the foot of one steeper than any we had yet met with, and still not the last one, and giving the thing up in despair reluctantly gave the order to go into camp. Our last wagon got in just at dark, and with no water for drinking or making coffee, and of course none for the animals, we laid down to rest, with many misgivings as to whether the latter, turned loose as most of them had to be, would not desert us during the night in search for water, of which they stood much in need after their hard and constant pull up the mountain. Fortunately we were able, with our sentinels, to keep them in camp, and shortly after four o'clock the next morning we were under way again, of course without breakfast, and pulling up the steep hills in front of us. With all the speed we could make, men assisting with drag-ropes, it was four hours before the last of our wagons reached the summit, the top of the mountain pointed out to us the evening before by Blodget.

And now our work, although still no child's play, became easier, and we rolled along down the steep slope of the mountain, removing the fallen timbers as we went along, until, at 10 o'clock, we

halted to cook breakfast in the rolling prairie of Ross's Hole. During the day a number of citizens overtook us, and also two of our officers, who had a long stern chase after us from Fort Benton and Camp Baker. After a good rest and a hearty breakfast we pushed ahead again, and on approaching the Bitter Root River, struck once more the trail of the Indians, and passed through one of their camps.

The last doubt now in regard to their route is removed, and they are evidently going into the Big Hole Basin, over the identical route followed by Captain Clarke in 1807, for the trail keeps up the South Fork of the Bitter Root. They do not appear to have increased their speed at all, and we find but one dead horse on the road, shot evidently after he had broken down. Is it possible these Indians do not know we are on their track, or have they such a contempt for the small force of "Walk-a-heeps"<sup>1</sup> that they want to invite an attack? It is true the thickly wooded country is not favorable to long views, but a small rear guard would serve to give the main camp ample notice, and so far not an Indian has been seen.

Later in the afternoon, having made only thirteen miles, we stop for the night near the head of a little valley and at the foot of the main divide of the Rocky Mountains, on ascending which, Blodget tells us, we will meet with a worse hill than any we have yet seen. Incredible as this appears, our incredulity is fully dispelled the next day.

In the mean time we form our bivouac, and Lieutenant Bradley, in charge of the advanced mounted party, comes to propose a night march for his command and an attempt to run off the Indian herd before daylight. Some twenty-five of the citizens who have joined us volunteer to accompany him, and at dark, with his force increased to about sixty men, all mounted, he leaves us and commences the ascent of the Rocky Mountains. The night proved very cold with a sharp frost. The command was astir early, got off a little after 5 o'clock, and soon commenced to ascend the slopes in front of us. The first ones, obstructed as they were with fallen timber, were bad enough, but we soon came to a part of the road which convinced us that Blodget had not been guilty of exaggeration in his description of it. The hill, almost 45° in inclination, could not be surmounted by winding round it in consequence of the masses of timber, both standing and fallen, and of adjacent precipices, and so had to be ascended direct. In addition to the other difficulties, the roadbed was formed of a mass of loose, shifting, rounded stones, upon which our poor animals could

---

<sup>1</sup> Indian name for infantry soldiers.



scarcely stand, much less pull. It was a "long road" to the top, and unfortunately had several "turns" in it, and these being very sharp ones, sadly interfered with the working of the long string of mules which we were obliged to attach to each wagon in turn. But the longest road must have an end, and so had this one, for in six hours after leaving camp, we reached the summit and commenced the long, gradual descent on the other side. This was not so difficult; yet it was by no means easy, for the timber, although smaller, stood much thicker on the ground, and a great deal had fallen across the road, which had to be removed before our wagons could pass. The road, too, was very crooked and in places marshy, so that it was a matter of wonder how our advance party could have gotten through at all in the darkness of the night. I received a dispatch from Lieutenant Bradley, before we reached the summit, informing me that the distance he had to pass over was greater than anticipated, and daylight had overtaken him before he had succeeded in reaching the Indian camp, and that he had concealed his party in the hills to await our arrival. Speed was now all the more important, as, should the Indians discover him, they might succeed in overwhelming his little party before we could join him.

Lewis and Clarke's *Journal*, under date of July 6th, 1807, says, "On reaching the other side, they came to Glade Creek, down which they proceeded, crossing it frequently into the glade on each side, where the timber was small and in many places destroyed by fire." This was precisely our experience now, except that having wagons instead of pack-mules, we were obliged to cross Glade Creek more frequently. As we proceeded, the crossings became more difficult, obscure and overgrown with brushwood, and here Blodget's services were inestimable to us. Riding ahead, he seemed to follow the obscure wagon-track by instinct, scarcely ever failed to hit at once the right crossing, and where that was washed out, to discover another. In this way we pushed ahead all day, not even stopping to rest or graze the mules, until our wagon-master came to complain that his mules were dropping in their harness, and his teams unable to go much farther. We then halted long enough to water and exchange the most wearied mules for some of the loose ones, and then resumed the march, for we had in the meantime passed another of the Indian camps, which showed us that the Indians had made another short march, and were as yet not alarmed. As our impatience to get forward increased, the difficulties of the route seemed to redouble. Again and again we recrossed the creek into the "glades" on each side, struggling through thick timber and in places swampy flats, in which our wagon-wheels sunk to the hub. Blodget informed us that we had one sharp, short hill to pull up, and after that would have but little

trouble. We had just reached the foot of this, and were preparing to double teams, when Bostwick, our Fort Shaw post-guide, rode up, and with a glow of excitement on his face, exclaimed, "We've got them, sir, we've got them!" at the same time handing me two bits of paper. One was from Lieutenant Bradley,<sup>1</sup> the other from Lieutenant Jacobs, who accompanied him, and both of the same import. The command was hid in the hills, within a short distance of the Indian camp, the herd of which had been seen, and by it the camp had been nearly located. It was thought the Indians had discovered the presence of the command, but that the camp might be surprised. Giving orders that the rear company (which happened to be Captain Logan's) should remain with the train, to help it up the hill, and push it along as fast as possible, I brought the remaining five companies to the front, and with the little mountain howitzer, hastened forward. But it was nearly sundown before we reached Lieutenant Bradley's position, near the mouth of the little valley down which we were travelling. Directly opposite the mouth, and projecting out into the open ground of the Big Hole Basin, was a high, bare hill, from the top of which a man could have looked directly up the valley, and have plainly seen every movement in it at the point where we stood, near which Lieutenant Bradley's party had been lying ever since early daylight. I was assured, however, that no Indians had been seen there, that the camp was supposed to be three or four miles distant down the stream to our left (east), and that it was resting in apparent security, Lieutenants Bradley and Jacobs having gone through the timber near enough to see a part of the animals grazing, to hear the sound of axes, and to hear the report of a rifle. It was now so late that it was not deemed best to move at once to the attack, but to wait for darkness to cover our march, and make the assault at daylight.

---

<sup>1</sup> As the last thing ever written by this officer, who was killed the next morning, this note is appended entire.

Aug. 8th, 1877.

BATTALION ADJUTANT.

SIR: I have the honor to report that I have personally seen the indications of an Indian camp situated in Big Hole, about three miles from my position. Lieutenant Jacobs accompanied me, and I have requested him to write a line in reference thereto. We saw horses grazing and mounted Indians, heard a gunshot, and the sound of axes. They evidently design staying all night, and from the anxious manner they have scouted the valley to the east, I judge that they have discovered a force in their front. They have seen my camp, but I do not expect them to attack me. Were the infantry to come up to-night we could attack them at daylight with great advantage, taking them in rear, as we have scouted the country well and found a safe and concealed route over the hills.

Very respectfully,

JAMES H. BRADLEY.

Marked, Received August 8th, 5.10 P.M.

The men were therefore permitted to rest, get something to eat, but without fires. The train was brought up, and just at dark closely parked in the bottom, the tired animals turned out to graze, and guards posted, to prevent them from straying. Additional ammunition was issued, so that each man should have ninety rounds, and all laid down to rest and wait for eleven o'clock, the hour designated for the movement to commence. I found that one of the citizens had preceded the column and been down to the mouth of the valley, from where he has seen some of the teepees, and he informed me of his ability to conduct us to the camp in the darkness.

It appeared to me so incredible that the Indians, knowing, as I supposed they necessarily must, we were on their track, should have no rearguard out or scouts to watch us, that I could not divest my mind of an apprehended "trap," and a fear, that whilst we were moving to surprise them we should ourselves be surprised. As may be imagined, therefore, not much of the time between dark and eleven o'clock was spent by me in sleep. To sleep, one's mind must be at rest, and mine was very far from it. We were obliged to leave a few men with the train, and I would gladly have taken our howitzer with us to add to the strength of the little command, but the trail was known to be rough and obstructed by timber, and the noise of removing this would in all probability betray us to the enemy. It was, therefore, decided to leave it behind, with orders to start to join us at the first break of day, bringing along a pack-mule loaded with two boxes of extra ammunition.

Promptly at eleven o'clock the command commenced its silent movement down the trail, all on foot except myself, Lieutenants Jacobs and Woodruff, and Bostwick, the Fort Shaw guide. Not one of these four horses got out of the battle with us alive. Lieutenant Bradley, with his party of soldiers, increased by thirty-four citizens, was placed in the advance, and arm in arm with the guide he moved off at the head of his party. The rest of us stumbled along after him in the dark, for I found it more satisfactory to walk than to ride. We tripped over the fallen timber, and now and then crossed streams and marshy places where we sunk over shoe-tops in mud. Once or twice a break occurred in the column, and the rear part got lost, so that the front had to halt, and finally to march at a snail's pace to enable the rear to keep up. The night, although bright starlight, was still so dark that objects could not be seen more than a few feet off. At length the trail began to improve, and skirting along the foot hills of an open valley we caught sight of a light glimmering in the distance. Strict silence was now enjoined upon all, and once or twice I moved to the front to counsel with and give instructions to Lieutenant Bradley. Light

after light now came in plain sight off in the valley to our right, and still with the apprehension of a trap before me I could scarcely hope we would not be discovered, and every moment expected to hear the crack of a rifle. Still we moved silently forward until, passing through a little belt of pine timber, which afterwards played an important part in our operations, we merged into the open beyond to find ourselves in the presence of a large herd of horses feeding on the hillside. As we approached the horses commenced to neigh, and the cry was taken up along the side-hill in a way which made me feel very uncomfortable. Fortunately, however, they did not become alarmed, and as we moved along the trail those nearest to us simply moved out of the way. The lights had now increased in number and the forms of the teepees could be indistinctly made out in the creek bottom below us. The dogs now commenced to bark, and as we halted abreast of the camp the cries of babies and the tone of conversation between the adults could be distinctly heard. The command now all laid down in the trail to rest and await the break of day, some of the men falling asleep. Those of us who did not do so had time to reflect upon our position, and this is the way it looked. Here we were, directly in the presence of, and undiscovered by, a band of hostile Indians. Their teepees, with their women and children, most of them asleep, were lying almost at our feet, whilst a large part of their herd, though by no means all of it, was on the opposite side of us. As soon as daylight came we would be discovered if we did not discover ourselves before, and then would come the conflict. Impressed with the importance of getting possession of the large herd which seemed to be almost within our grasp, I turned to Bostwick and directed him to take a few of the citizens, get round the herd and drive it back on our trail. He replied at once, "Why, General, there are probably a number of warriors around the herd guarding it." He was an old frontiersman, had lived for years amongst the Indians, and knew their habits well. His remark appeared to me so plausible, that impressed with the importance of not too soon creating an alarm I yielded at once to his suggestion. Almost immediately afterwards he said, "They have discovered us; don't you hear them?" I listened, and certainly there appeared to be more conversation and a stir in the camp; but this seemed to subside almost immediately, and we strained our ears to catch any new sound. "If they have not discovered us," said Bostwick now, "their fires will all die down, and just before daylight you will see the squaws begin to light them up again as it gets cold." A portion of the command, deployed as skirmishers, was now sent down into the bottom, and as a faint light appeared in the eastern horizon, a firebrand was seen to move from one

teepee to another in the camp from which now not a sound issued. The whole command except one company was now sent down into the willow-covered flat, and the word passed along to push forward to the village. As the light increased the features of the landscape came into view. At the foot of the bluff (some thirty or forty feet high), upon which we stood, commenced the flat of the creek bottom, covered except in spots with a thick growth of willows, in places almost impassable. This extended some two or three hundred yards across to Ruby Creek, a fine bold stream, in places waist deep. Between the foot of the bluffs and Ruby Creek extended up and down stream an old bed of the creek, now a stagnant slough filled with water and soft mud. On the opposite side of Ruby Creek was the Indian camp, extended out in a straggling open V along the bank of the creek. The line moved slowly forward, men and officers wading the slough and struggling through the brush as best they could. It was now getting so light that the whole outline of the camp could be made out, as well as the forms of our men as they moved forward. The camp was as still as death, and no sign of life was visible except the gradual increase of light in the camp-fires, where the squaws were evidently replenishing them.

Suddenly off on the left of the line a single rifle-shot broke on the still morning air, followed by another, and another, and then the whole line opened, and with a shout swept forward towards the teepees. The startled and completely surprised Indians rushed from the tents only to find themselves cut down by a withering fire from the brush, towards which some of them instinctively ran for shelter, whilst most of them scattered away from the fire out on the open prairie and up and down the creek. The last remaining company was sent in on the right at a run, and reached the upper end of the village just where the creek, making a bend towards us, afforded by its steeply-cut bank admirable shelter for the Indians, who, huddling together, opened a fire upon our men as they entered the village about its middle at the apex of the V. These were now taken in the rear, many of them slaughtered, and with loud shouts of triumph the whole command swept through the village. Many of the Indians still remained in the teepees, and some still alive and unwounded fired upon the men when tearing open the tents. One young officer narrowly escaped death at the hands of a squaw, who fired a pistol at him as he opened the door, and the next moment fell dead with a bullet through her brain. Some of the women and boys fought like the men, while others sought safety behind the creek-banks, crouching down with the water up to their waists. In crossing the stream near the upper end of the village I saw three of these poor wretches, one with a

baby in her arms, seated in the water behind a clump of bushes, and as I passed along one of them made me a salutation with her hand, as if to claim my protection. I tried to explain to her that she was safe, and beckoned her to come out, but none of them moved, and they remained there till we left the village.

Although we had complete possession of the village and had commenced to set fire to the teepees, the Indians had not by any means given up the fight, and we soon began to feel the effects of their long rifles and their superior marksmanship. But few of them remained in the brush near the village, but these few at every favorable opportunity sent a bullet whistling into our scattered disorganized ranks as the men ran from teepee to teepee setting them on fire, and shots soon came pouring into us from all directions. Depressions on the open prairie, points on the distant hills, and the trees and rocks on the trail we had just left, three and four hundred yards distant, were occupied by these unseen marksmen. The fire was not heavy, that is, was not very rapid and continuous, but at the crack of almost every one of those distant rifles some member of the command fell, and with this kind of fire we could not compete, for (it must be admitted), with very few exceptions, the command did not contain any such marksmen as these Nez Percés, drilled to the use of the rifle from childhood, showed themselves to be.

I noticed that as soon as the rifles commenced to crack, all the different herds of horses ran right together, bunched up like a flock of frightened sheep, and then moved off. The small herds in the valley were soon under control of the Indians, and immediately after we got possession of the village mounted men could be seen moving at full speed over the hills, some giving orders and others collecting the horses.

It soon became evident that losing men rapidly by the close fire of the Indians and unable to inflict any more harm upon them, it was necessary that we should occupy some position where we would be more on an equality with our foe. Orders were therefore given to leave the village and withdraw towards the bluffs we had started from. This was done, and as soon as the command reached the foot of the bluffs, and was protected from the fire coming from the high ground on that side, and hidden on the other side by the brush of the valley, it was pushed along towards the point of small pine timber which projected into the valley and through which we had passed the night before. This was already occupied by a few Indians, and these being driven out we took possession of the timber and disposed the men behind logs and other obstacles, prepared for a defence, which all knew we should soon be called on to make; nor were we permitted to wait long.

Just as we reached the timber, two shots from our little howitzer,

which it will be remembered was to follow us at the first break of day, were heard up the valley, and about a mile from us; of course we knew that this meant the death-knell of the little party with it, and as the Indians were thus shown to be between us and our inadequately protected train, the fear was a very natural one, that that too had, in Western phraseology, "gone up."

We had, however, but little time to speculate upon such subjects, or give much attention to any matters beyond the limits of our contracted horizon, for the Indians had now gathered about us, and from the timber above and the brush below, their rifle-shots began to seek out every exposed spot in our position. At first the men excitedly replied to every rifle-shot with a perfect shower of bullets, so that the Indians drew sometimes fifty bullets for one of their own, and every effort of the officers had to be exerted to restrain the firing, lest we should fall short of ammunition, and thus become an easy prey to a determined dash of the Indians. That they would make at least one such was confidently felt by all, and preparations were made to meet it. The men were distributed according to the needs of each point, and under the sharp fire which now assailed us, logs were placed in position and holes dug in the soft sandy soil with the invaluable Rice bayonet.

In the meantime, and whilst this fight was going on, a wail of grief came up from the Indian village as the extent of the damage we had done there became known, and the shrill cry of the squaws was mingled with the exhortation of the chiefs as they urged on their followers to wreak vengeance on us; one particular voice in the village could be distinctly heard by us haranguing the camp, and it seemed to have its effect upon the Indians who surrounded us, for when that paused an Indian in the timber above or the brush below us would shout out his commands, the others would respond with yells, and a shower of bullets would come whistling through the timber, cutting the limbs from over our heads and now and then striking some one less perfectly protected than the rest. These volleys, which at first caused almost every rifle of ours to go off in reply, were now received more coolly, and the men learned to watch for the smoke, and fire at that more deliberately and of course with greater effect. Finding too that the Indians showed no disposition to expose themselves unnecessarily in the open ground, and stuck to their trees and logs as closely as we did, all became more confident, and now very little ammunition was wasted in replying to these volleys.

The Indians, after loudly lamenting their dead, soon began to take down their teepees, and after packing up their things and collecting their horses the main body moved off over the hills to the southward. The fighting force, however, still remained around us, and as if watching the progress of the fight, small parties of mounted

Indians, evidently attending the chiefs, remained on the hills, whilst a large herd of horses made its appearance on a prominent hill to the eastward of us and remained there till late in the afternoon.

The long weary hours of the day wore on with more or less firing all the time, and even when there was a lull the slightest imprudence on the part of any one in exposing himself was sure to cause a shower of bullets. Our poor wounded were placed in the most sheltered position, and dragged through the long painful hours with such attendance as we were able to bestow upon them, for we were without a doctor, and such few medical supplies as we had were of course with the train.

The Indians, despairing of carrying our position by assault, now resorted to a stratagem, which strongly reminded us of one feature of the sham battle at Fort Shaw, mentioned in the forepart of this article. A strong breeze was blowing from the west, and from the grass which grew upon the hillside in that direction a wreath of smoke was seen to rise. This soon gathered in volume, and the fire commenced to sweep towards us over the hill, driven forward by the breeze. This was a new and dangerous foe, for although the grass about us was sparse and green, much of the timber was dead and dry, and should the fire reach any of the heaps of dead timber and brush near us, we would be smoked out of our position like rats in a hole, and the Indians would doubtless take advantage of our being blinded by the smoke, to make that dash upon us which every one had been anticipating ever since we reached the position. The progress of the fire was, therefore, contemplated with an anxiety which I suspect no one can feel unless staring grim death directly in the face, and as each new puff of smoke was wafted towards us it seemed to give us a foretaste of what we might have to suffer when, blinded by thick clonds of it, we might be called upon to meet a desperate charge of our foes. Every one nerved himself anew, and grasped his piece ready to act when the crisis came, and knowing that there was nothing to be done for any one except to die right there; for to retreat was out of the question. *There was no place to retreat to.* Slowly the fire struggled along through the thin grass, now dying away, now shooting up with fresh vigor as it reached some little pile of dry brush in its path, each fresh progress greeted with exultant yells by the hidden savages, and a sigh of relief escaped more than one of us when the wind slowly died out, and the fire on the side-hill followed its example.

The hostile demonstration now somewhat abated, but the slightest imprudence was sure to bring a reminder in the shape of bullets, to show us the enemy was still on the alert. As night closed in upon us, we came to the conclusion that the Indians would post-



pone their attack till morning, and after contracting our lines and making what additional dispositions we could to meet it, we prepared as best we could for a night's repose. Of course much rest was out of the question, for in addition to the fact that the Indians kept up their fire at intervals till a late hour, the night was very cold, we could build no fires and had no blankets. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks, and the knowledge of our peril, the officers had to keep constantly on the move amongst the exhausted men to keep them on the alert, and prevent them from going to sleep. The disciplined soldier, accustomed to look for orders from his officer, can, under such circumstances, throw off all responsibility from his mind and sleep soundly in the midst of danger. With the undisciplined it is different, and we soon became aware of this from the feeling developed amongst our civilian allies. During the night, whilst dozing, covered up in pine boughs, I became aware of a conversation going on between one of our officers and a citizen, and my attention was arrested by the officer saying he did not wish the citizen to express such sentiments as he had uttered in the presence of our men. I found on inquiry, that the man had been expressing the conviction that at daylight in the morning the Indians would make a desperate assault on us, and that we were all bound, in his expressive phraseology, "to go up." He was therefore in favor of taking advantage of the darkness to get away. I spoke very sharply to him, told him he was now by his own act under military control, that the command was going to remain where it was, and he must remain with it. Notwithstanding this he and a number of the other citizens stole out of camp under cover of the darkness and made their escape.

Before night closed in I engaged two of the citizens who knew the country, to start during the night and carry through dispatches to Deer Lodge, some ninety miles distant. They got off about midnight, travelled all the way to French's Gulch (forty miles) on foot, there borrowed horses, and took the first news of the battle to Deer Lodge. By them I sent an official dispatch to General Terry, and one to Governor Potts, asking for transportation, medical supplies, and doctors for our wounded. I wrote a similar request to be shown to anybody our couriers might meet, setting forth our wants, supposing that our train had been captured, and that we would be entirely dependent upon what the settlers could send us for food, and to get our wounded away from the field. These two last dispatches were taken to the telegraph office in Deer Lodge, and *both* dispatched as if directed to Governor Potts. This gave rise to the impression that they were not authentic, though some of the papers, in order to correct what they deemed an error, gave the

dispatches different dates, and represented one as written on the eighth day before the battle!

Shivering with cold, it was no difficult matter for us all to be alert at the first appearance of daylight, ready for the anticipated assault; but it did not come, and as the sun made its appearance in the eastern horizon and commenced to cast his warming rays upon us, we began to realize that our perils were probably over. At half-past six a citizen rode into our camp from the direction of the train, announcing himself as a courier from General Howard. He was asked if General Howard was on his way up, and a loud cheer burst from the men around me as he answered in the affirmative. He was then asked in regard to our train, but said he had seen nothing of it, and this confirmed the impression that it had been destroyed. On being cross-questioned, however, he admitted passing in the darkness a number of animals, which he took for Indian ponies, and that he might have passed the train without seeing it, which turned out to be the case. Half an hour afterwards another messenger from General Howard, a sergeant of cavalry, came in, and although his dispatch was previous to the one just received, his arrival relieved our minds in regard to the safety of our train, for he informed me that he had spent the night before at it, being unable to come to us the afternoon before on account of the Indians who were about us.

Scouts were now sent out and communicated with the train, but these encountered Indians, who again made their appearance around us, and a part of our force was sent out to bring the train to us. In the meantime we were without provisions, and now that the mental strain of anxiety was removed, empty stomachs began to assert their rights and cry aloud for food. The only one of our four horses brought out of the fight was wounded, and soon after we reached the timber he was killed by one of the shots fired at us. That night he was butchered, and before our train reached us the next day *horse-steaks* were voted very palatable.

After we had time to think over the incidents of the day, one was recalled which created a good deal of amusement. The second messenger who came to us, the cavalry sergeant, had a small piece of bread and a smaller piece of ham, which he very generously turned over to me. It is customary whenever men from another command reach a post to "*attach*" them to a company of the garrison for the purpose of drawing rations. The adjutant *says* that as soon as I got the sergeant's bread and ham I called to him and directed him "to attach the sergeant to a company for rations." He conducted the sergeant to where an unskinned, somewhat repulsive-looking *horse-leg* was lying in the dust, and said: "Sergeant,

here is the commissary, help yourself!" The sergeant replied he had been to breakfast and didn't feel hungry just then.

Our train reached us about sundown, and the camp was soon enlivened by brisk fires, around which the men gathered to recite the incidents of the fight, whilst the much-needed provisions were cooking, and for the first time we learned of the particulars of the struggle with the howitzer. In its attempt to join us, the men in charge of it were encountered by Indians, who opened fire upon them when it had reached within about a mile of us. Two of the men cowardly ran at the first fire, whilst the others loaded and fired the piece twice, and then, the horses being killed, used their rifles until, one of them being killed and two of the others wounded, the remainder succeeded in making their way back to the train under the guidance of Blodget, who was with them. They threw away the friction primers, so that the gun could not be fired, and then left it, together with over two thousand rounds of extra rifle ammunition, in possession of the enemy. We recovered the gun afterwards, but the Indians had taken off and carried away the wheels, implements, and shells, portions of which were afterwards found high up on the adjacent hills. That night late, after all but the guard were snugly wrapped in their blankets for a good night's rest, we received a parting volley from a distance, which had the effect of sending us hurriedly to our rifle-pits, but this proved to be the final farewell, and we saw no more of our foes.

Thus terminated the battle of the Big Hole, or as some of the papers got it, Big Hole Pass. It was fought on the open prairie, on the banks of Ruby Creek, a tributary of the Big Hole River, the "Wisdom River" of Lewis and Clarke. Our total loss was twenty-nine killed, including two officers, Captain Logan and Lieutenant Bradley, and forty wounded, including five officers, one of whom (Lieutenant English) afterwards died. The loss on the part of the Indians, was estimated at between eighty and ninety killed, most of those left on the field being buried, when we next visited the site of the village, on the 11th. On the morning of that day a party was sent over the field to bury our dead. All were recognized and buried where they fell. The number of Indian dead would have remained a matter of conjecture to us, but for the fact that the Indian scouts who came with the advance of the Oregon column, which reached our position that day, went upon the field, and with the triple purpose of recognition, scalping, and plunder, dug up the bodies. In this way the Indian loss in killed became known with tolerable accuracy.

A visit to the site of the village disclosed some facts of interest. The Indians evidently considered themselves safe from any imme-

diate pursuit. Many of their teepee poles, in place of being dry poles, collected for temporary use, as in all their previous camps, were green, carefully peeled, and bored at the end for permanent use.\* In addition to this, large quantities of the *Camas* root had been collected, and pits were found where it was being prepared for food. For this process, three days, we are told, are required, so that the Indians intended to occupy that camp at least that length of time. They evidently had not the slightest idea of being disturbed.

Whilst our burial parties were occupied on the field, on the morning of the 11th, General Howard, with a small escort, rode into our camp, and right glad were we to see him, for his arrival assured us of speedy medical assistance for our wounded. General Howard had pressed forward, ahead of his troops, with a few Indian scouts and mounted soldiers, supposing he was coming to the relief of a sorely pressed and starving party. He was, therefore, greatly surprised to find us out of all danger, and better off for food than he was. His medical officers reached us early the next morning (12th) and thoroughly examined and dressed all our wounded. To my surprise, they informed me that among all the wounded there was but one single case in which a doctor on the spot could have been of any material assistance. That was a man whose cheek had been laid open with a bullet, and had a doctor been present he could have sewed it up, and prevented an ugly scar. General Howard's cavalry got up in the afternoon, and as his supplies and infantry had not yet arrived, I turned over to him all the surplus provisions we had, and with his cavalry reinforced with fifty of my infantry, he the next day (13th) continued the pursuit of the Indians, now some twenty-five miles away, in the direction of Bannock, whilst the remainder of my force, the wounded loaded in wagons, and two of the worst cases on Indian "travois," constructed on the spot, moved out eastward over the rough prairie, towards Deer Lodge, some ninety miles away. The horrors of that march for those having wounds can not easily be imagined. With the exception of Lieutenant English and Sergeant Watson, who were the two carried on "travois" constructed in our camp, and both of whom afterwards died in Deer Lodge, all the wounded were carried in common baggage wagons without springs. For some distance there was no road, and our way lay over a rolling prairie, covered with bunch and buffalo grass and sage brush. As our wagons bounced over these, the effect on the wounded may be imagined, but cannot be described.

After we had proceeded about twelve or fifteen miles, our hearts were gladdened by the appearance of a great crowd of ambulances,

wagons, buggies, etc., loaded with all sorts of necessities and luxuries, which the good people of Deer Lodge, Butte and Helena had promptly started out to our relief. Our progress now towards the settlements was both more speedy and more comfortable, and our entrance into Deer Lodge, two days afterwards, will not soon be forgotten by any member of the little party. The whole town turned out and gave us a reception, and, best of all, the ladies of the place came forward and took complete charge of all the wounded, feeding and fostering them until the unwounded ones sighed at the absence of wounds, which would have entitled them to such attentions.

---

### VERNACULAR VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE, OLD AND NEW.

*The Holy Bible, According to the Authorized Version* (A. D. 1611). With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New Testament, Vol. I., St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1878. Royal 8vo.

**I**N a previous article it was shown, that it was the irreverent, impious intent of early heretics, in using Scripture for the support of their private judgment, to utterly overthrow God's Word, either by destroying its letter, or by perverting its spirit, as best happened to suit their purpose. As Tertullian says of the heretics of his time—"Alius *manu* Scripturas; alius *sensus expositione* intervertit" (De Præscript. cap. 38). That is to say, "This one boldly raises his hand (armed with the *knife, machæra*, as he says in parallel passages), against the Scripture; another, less bold and more cunning, uses gloss and commentary to pervert its sense." In other words, some lay violent hands upon God's Word, and cut out without scruple the book, chapter, or verse that conflicts with their private opinion; others adopt a seemingly milder but no less impious way, forcing the text by subtle exposition to coincide with the individual opinion or sectarian system they may have adopted.

To this latter plan belongs the artful pretext of translating, for

common use, the Sacred Books, from the original idiom into the languages of our day. The Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek of Scripture are all dead languages, that ceased to be spoken centuries before modern heresy arose. They are in the truest sense of the word, "unknown tongues" for the unlearned, who form the greatest portion of the class which claims an "open Bible" as its birthright; as inaccessible to them as to the great bulk of Catholics, who content themselves with reading the "dead letter" in due subordination to the Living Voice.

In days of old, especially whilst the original language of the New Testament was alive and current among the Christian people, there was little room for attempting by this process to deceive the unwary reader. But even before the birth of Christianity, Hebrew, the original language of the Old Testament, had died out as a spoken tongue. And it was on this alone that heresy could try her "prentice hand." True to her instincts she did so. But from the nature of things, as there were no printing facilities in that day, this could not frequently happen. The only instances we find were those of Ebionites or Judaizing Christians, to whom the version of the Seventy seemed too favorable to certain doctrines of Christianity, from which their private judgment dissented. Those of them whose versions have survived, but only in a fragmentary state, are Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus.

Their object in translating was twofold. In the first place, to break down the authority of the Septuagint, which was quoted as authority by the Christians in their controversies with the Jews. The better to effect this, Aquila translated with extreme literal rigor, in order that the difference between the original Hebrew and the quotations (according to the version of the LXX.) alleged from it in the Greek New Testament, might the more forcibly strike any common reader and inspire him with distrust of the good faith of the Seventy Interpreters. But their most important point was to weaken by studied mistranslation the force of the prophetic passages of the Old Testament, which foretold the coming of our Lord in the flesh, His wonderful Incarnation, His Atonement, and His Godhead. Thus Aquila's renderings of Gen. i. 1, 5, and elsewhere, in which the Hebrew idiom is carried bodily into Greek, in utter defiance of grammar and sense, were only a blind. They were remote approaches intended to win the confidence of the incautious reader, and thus lead him to swallow in the end such wicked perversions as that of Isaiah vii. 14, where the Hebrew word *Alma* is translated *νεανίς* (girl, or young woman), and not, as has been properly rendered by the LXX., *παρθένος* (virgin). Thus all the significance of that noble prophecy, "Lo! a virgin shall conceive and bear a son," is lost, and one of the leading articles of

Christian faith is slyly undermined. The word "virgin" is found in all versions, ancient and modern, Catholic and non-Catholic, and is sanctioned by the New Testament, which alleges the prophecy for that very reason.

It might be reasonably expected that no one bearing the name of Christian could fail to resent with just indignation, or at least to qualify by its proper name, this impious mistranslation, so injurious to the Gospel, to Christ our Lord, and to the Holy Ghost, who inspired Isaias. Not so. An Anglican divine,<sup>1</sup> who enjoys, and deservedly, the name of a great Biblical scholar, has his kind word to interpose on behalf of Aquila. He does it cautiously, but the writer's meaning cannot be mistaken. After admitting what cannot be denied, that "it is sufficiently attested that this (Aquila's) version was formed for controversial purposes" (a very mild way, indeed, of stating the case!) he adds the charitable suggestion, that after all, "these renderings were perhaps rather modes of avoiding an argument than direct falsification." It is, it would seem, quite a lucky thing for a man's fame with posterity, when he has come down for the first fifteen centuries in ill-repute with Christ's Church and all her children. This, no matter what his character or deeds, appears to be his best passport to sympathy and excuse at the hands of the non-Catholic world. If one of our illustrious saints had been charged, justly or unjustly, with misdeed or foible, we fear the moral perceptions of our divine would have been thoroughly roused, and he would have lashed it with unsparing rigor. But his heart (he cannot help it, for it is in the nature of things), warms to the Ebionite, and he comes forward with his kindly word of apology. Is it, we venture to ask, allowable or honest to frame versions of Scripture on a controversial basis? Or is it possible for poor human nature to set about the task of translating God's Word "for controversial purposes," and not transfuse into the Sacred Text human controversy and commentary, while pretending to give the reader God's pure, unadulterated Revelation? One word, at times, skilfully added or altered, is quite sufficient to settle a controversy *in the text*, without having recourse to notes. And to do this in order "to avoid an argument" is no excuse, no palliation, but an aggravation of the offence. If the argument be really in the text, to elude it by mistranslation is not only to suppress what is true, but to convey what is false. And the excuse, that this wanton, wicked tampering with the oracles of the Holy Ghost is not "direct falsification," may commend itself to some as a clever

<sup>1</sup> Dr. S. P. Tregelles. His apology for Aquila acquires a peculiar significance, when it is remembered that he was chosen as one of the Board for the revision of the Anglican version. Would he be likely to be *very* severe on its "controversial purposes," and its "modes of avoiding an argument," contained in the original?

point of fine-spun casuistry, but for the true Christian it can mean but one thing, betrayal of God's revealed Word to its enemies.

But, to come back from this digression, were there in the early Church no translations made into other tongues for the benefit of the converted nations that did not understand Greek and Hebrew? Unquestionably; and amongst them the most deserving of mention are the Latin and the Syriac. It was a matter of necessity; because the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, the Liturgy, and Divine Office were made up in great part of the writings of the Old and New Testament. And the Church never would have allowed her ministers to represent Christ at the altar, or to administer His sacraments in a tongue unknown to them. The Holy Books were, therefore, translated, but by faithful men under the auspices of the Church, and with her approbation. The work was undertaken, not by private whim, nor with heretical intent to color and pervert God's Word by mistranslation for sectarian or "controversial purposes." If any one, even from not unworthy motives of private devotion, undertook the task, his work met a suitable fate, and soon faded away into oblivion. Of the many Latin versions that were thus made, as we learn from St. Augustine, not one has survived to our day.

It is not, however, of such men that we wish to speak. Whether moved to translate by the voice of authority, or by the mere prompting of private devotion, they always acted in good faith. Some of them may have erred occasionally from ignorance, but it was involuntary on their part. They would have shuddered at the thought of deliberately falsifying God's Word. We speak of those others who sat down ostensibly to *translate*, but really intending to *mistranslate*, in order to obtain some show of divine authority for their own errors or those of their sect. It was not that they wished to circulate God's revealed Word and saving Truth amongst the people. This was the pretext. What they really meant was, what heresy even now means, under cover of His Word to circulate their own human word, their novelties and false doctrines. But the number of such translators in early times was necessarily limited. The only dead language which could serve their purpose, was the Hebrew, and those who acquired a theoretical knowledge of its remains were very few. Hence mistranslation was of necessity confined to Palestine or its neighborhood, and, as we have seen, was attempted only by Judaizing Christians.

Subsequently, when, besides Hebrew and Greek, even Latin had become a dead language throughout Europe, and was no longer understood, save by a few scholars, there grew up an increased necessity for translation, unless the reading of the Scriptures was to be confined to the learned few. But the Church has never in-



sisted that the perusal of Scripture should be the privilege of the few, however learned. She does not impose on her children any obligation of reading the inspired Volume, for she was taught otherwise by Christ her Founder and His apostles. Nor does she allow them to "search the Scriptures," that is, to determine its meaning by the standard of private interpretation. She, who received her commission to teach, and fulfilled it long before a line of the New Testament was written, remembers well that it was written for no such purpose. But she is willing and anxious that all her children should enjoy the benefit of reading those Holy Books, provided they be read according to the spirit in which they were dictated by the Holy Ghost, and written out under His inspiration. They were not given us as problems for our investigation, but as lessons for our correction and our edification. So St. Paul tells us of all Scripture, and especially of his own Epistles. "*Hæc autem omnia . . . scripta sunt ad correptionem vestram.*" "*In Christo loquimur : omnia autem propter ædificationem vestram.*"<sup>1</sup>

It was not, however, to be expected that, during the Middle Ages, translations into the vernacular should be abundant; for, in the first place, during a long period of that time the troubled condition of Europe checked the diffusion of anything like general culture. Yet, in spite of all difficulties, the Church did what she could under the circumstances to spread mere human learning among the people. And what she did, considering the obstacles she had to encounter, was something truly wonderful. The European nations owe to her efforts that they ever emerged from barbarism. But in every time her principal care was to provide a Christian education for all classes, high and low, learned and unlearned. And after all, whatever the Pagan world of to-day may think, this is man's *summum bonum*, by the side of which all else that he may acquire of worldly lore shrinks almost into nothing. And a great part of that education, to the horror of modern ears be it said, consisted in making them acquainted with the Bible. Only a few could read its pages in manuscript, but she contrived to set it before the eyes of the multitude. The paintings—those books of the illiterate—with which she lavishly adorned her temples and sanctuaries, were chiefly devoted to Bible history. It was

<sup>1</sup> Nothing could be more absurd than to suppose this command (if such it were, which it is not) addressed to Christians. If any one will read it in the Evangelist's context, he will readily discover that it is only a rebuke administered to the wicked Scribes and Pharisees, who "persecuted and sought to slay" (John v. 16) our Blessed Lord. It would be hard for any Christian to admit this character in himself, or in the Church to which he belonged.

<sup>2</sup> "Now all these things . . . are written for our correction" (I. Cor. x. 11). "We speak before God in Christ; but all things, my dearly beloved, for your edification" (II. Cor. xii. 19).

in these holy places that old and young loved to congregate and spend their leisure hours on Sunday and festivals—not in the gin-shop and beer-garden, or on rifle-club excursions, or locked in and carousing privately for fear of Judaizing elders, as their descendants do now in England, Germany, Switzerland,<sup>1</sup> and Scotland. The priest or schoolmaster pointed out the figures in the picture, and explained the history of each to the attentive, delighted crowd. Parents rehearsed the story to their children at home. And thus there was diffused through the generations of men a traditional knowledge of all the great personages of the Bible from Genesis down to the Apocalypse. It would not be rash to assert that some of those illiterate mediæval Christians, on whom we look down with such contempt, would not only compare favorably with many amongst us in a knowledge of Bible history, but would put to shame not a few of those who profess to read the Bible and do not, aye many of our Catholics, who have received what is called a fine education, and whose only way of showing it is by their steadfast devotion to lying newspapers, frivolous magazines, and trashy novels, which are half the time immoral and unchristian.<sup>2</sup>

As we have already remarked, during a long period of the Middle Ages a lack of general education, arising from the nature of the times, was of itself sufficient to account for the fewness of translations. Another special reason, growing out of this general one, was the rude, imperfect condition of the vernacular tongues which the new peoples had imported into Europe, or which had grown up on its soil after Latin had ceased to be spoken. These tongues had grammars of their own, unwritten grammars, if you will, but rich in inherent powers of development and perfectibility, as time has shown. But they had not been as yet developed. Besides, it must be remembered, that to the small but imperceptibly growing crowd of those who, thanks to the fostering care of the Church, to a solid Christian training united the knowledge of letters and science, a translation was unnecessary, for all culture at that day presupposed the knowledge of the Latin language. And the Vulgate of St. Jerome amply supplied the wants of every reader of the Bible. Yet even then there appeared not a few versions in the vernacular, total or partial, of the book of Scripture. Thus in those very countries where even children are now taught that their

<sup>1</sup> See Laing's "Notes of a Traveller," where he speaks of how the Sunday is kept in Calvin's home, Geneva. The author is a Scotch Presbyterian, and his honesty and truthfulness are so evident, that even a Catholic reader must feel disposed to pardon his occasional outbursts of Scotch Calvinism.

<sup>2</sup> Nor should we overlook the moral effects of such pictures. They were perpetual admonitions, sermons speaking to the heart of each beholder. "The painter," says St. Basil, "does by his art what the preacher does by his eloquence."—(Homily on the Forty Martyrs, inter Opp. Basilii, Ed. Garnier. Paris: 1722, tom. ii., p. 179.)

Christian forefathers were buried in damnable idolatry for over eight hundred years,<sup>1</sup> there were not wanting during that same period zealous Bible students, who did their best to promote the reading of God's Word, by translating it into the vernacular for the benefit of laymen who could read.

In proof of this we need only refer to the labors of Venerable Bede, Aldhelm, and Aelfric, and to the Durham Book (of Gospels), in England; and to Notker's<sup>2</sup> Psalter, and William's<sup>3</sup> of Bamberg's

<sup>1</sup> "So . . . not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise, not the people only but the bishops, not the sheep but also the shepherds themselves . . . being blinded by the bewitching of images, as blind guides of the blind, fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry. In the which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age, by the space of above eight hundred years." And again on the same page, "So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children OF WHOLE CHRISTENDOM (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more." Certain sermons or homilies appointed to be read in churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory, and now thought fit to be reprinted by authority from the King's Most Excellent Majesty (the "merry monarch" Charles II., who made his peace with God by embracing this "idolatry" on his death-bed). Oxford, 1683, p. 150.

That this assertion, as impious as it is extravagant, should have escaped the lips of some furious bigot in the heat of angry controversy, would not be so very surprising; but that a Church, calling itself Christian, should give it her deliberate sanction and insert it in her liturgy, where it remains till this day, is something so outrageous that words fail with which properly to characterize it. Instead of hurting the Catholic Church, it is her own condemnation, for it proves how little she has in common with the meek "Dove," prefigured symbol of the heavenly spouse and true Church of Christ.

It would be interesting to have the date assigned whence we are to count back this dark millennium of idolatry. Was it when Luther first rebelled in 1517? Or when the light of the new "Gospel" first flashed from Anne Boleyn's eyes in 1526? Or when the Church of England was thoroughly Calvinized under Edward VI.? Or must we go back to the days of the "first reformer," Wickliffe, about 1350? This will carry us back near the days of St. Jerome, to whom chiefly, under God and His Church, Europe owes it that she had the Bible during those centuries.

<sup>2</sup> See Notker's "Psalmen nach der Wiener Handschrift herausgegeben von Richard Heinzel und Wilhelm Scherer, Strasburg, 1876." This precious monument of Old German literature had been previously published according to the St. Gall MS., in Schilter's Thesaurus (Ulm, 1726), with the notes of Father Francke, Librarian of the Monastery of St. Gall. The author was known as Notker Labeo, to distinguish him from two or rather three other Notkers, all illustrious men in their day; Notker, Bishop of Liege, Notker Physicus, and Notker Balbulus, author of the famous sequence, "Media vita" ("In the midst of life we are in death").

<sup>3</sup> The Preface or "Prologus" alone, of William (Guilleramus, or Willeramus), of Bamberg, was published by Martene & Durand in their "Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Amplissima Collectio." Tom. I., p. 508. In a note the editors give the first few lines in Latin and German, and no more, as they say the work had been already published with the Works of Hildebert, by the Maurine Father Beaugendre, in 1708, who had, however, falsely attributed it to Marbodius, Bishop of Rennes, in Bretagne—a strange mistake, but repeated after Beaugendre by many writers. What is yet stranger, neither Martene nor Beaugendre seem to have known the original edition of

Canticle of Canticles in Germany. Notker's version grew immediately into great favor with those who could read only the vernacular; and an old writer<sup>1</sup> who came soon after, calls it "Psalterium, in quo omnes, qui *barbaricam*<sup>2</sup> legere sciunt, multum delectantur." He adds that the Empress Kisila (so he calls Gisela, wife of Conrad II., and mother of Henry III.) was very fond of reading Notker's works, and engaged the monks of St. Gall to transcribe for her own use a copy of his Psalter and his Job. "Kisila imperatrix, operum ejus avidissima, psalterium ipsum et Job sibi exemplari<sup>3</sup> sollicitè fecit."<sup>4</sup> The translation of Job here alluded to is no longer in existence. The Canticle of William of Bamberg was paraphrased by him in Latin elegiacs, as well as translated into Teutonic prose. His poetry, considering the age when he wrote, is remarkably good. As to the matter, his theological and exegetical skill was not only extolled in his day, but has excited the admiration of learned Protestants.<sup>5</sup>

Such versions, though few compared to our times of printing, were more numerous and more popular in the Middle Ages than many nowadays are willing to acknowledge, some through religious jealousy, others (even Catholics) through supercilious contempt of what their pride (or their ignorance rather) has taught them to look upon as a period of universal darkness. When, however, we recall the fact that the sovereigns<sup>6</sup> and courts of Germany and England (the great Alfred was not only a patron of such versions, but a translator himself), it is natural to conclude that studies of the kind must not only have prevailed among

---

William's "Canticle," published at Hagenau, in 1528, by Molterus. See "Willeram, Abbatis in Cantica Salomonis Mystica Explanatio per Menradum Moltherum in lucem restituta. Hagenoae (G. Geltz), 1528. 12mo."

<sup>1</sup> In Pertz's Collection, II. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Barbarous* here means simply the language of the common people, as opposed to the Latin, which was the language of the schools. To give a sample of the radical identity of Notker's German with that of to-day, we subjoin his version of the first verse of the first Psalm: "Der man ist salig der in dero argon rat ne gienc (Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum), noh an dero suntigen vvege ne stuont (et in via peccatorum non stetit), noh an demo suhtstuole ne saz (et in cathedra pestilentie non sedit)." There is no other language of Western Europe that can produce a document written a thousand years ago, which comes so near its present form of speech.

<sup>3</sup> "Exemplo, as (to copy) a mediæval word of frequent use. It dates back as far at least as Ruricius, Bishop of Limoges, in the fifth century. It was used also by St. Augustine, but in another sense: 'to make an example of,' *i.e.*, 'ludibrio palam exponere.'"

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Heinzel's *Vorgeschichte* prefixed to the edition of 1876, p. xlvii.

<sup>5</sup> See the high encomium on his paraphrase by the erudite scholar Junius, quoted by Cave in his *Historia Literaria*, art. *Willeramus*.

<sup>6</sup> A Teutonic version of the Scriptures was also made by order of Charlemagne.

courtiers, but must have spread to a wider circle of readers. This lesson is taught by the history of every age.

Componitur orbis  
Regis ad exemplum.<sup>1</sup>

And no doubt, where there are many readers, there must have been a suitable provision of writers, translators and paraphrasts to supply proportionately the demands of mediæval Bible-readers. And as in most cases, if not all exclusively, these writers were monks or ecclesiastics of some kind, it is clear that the Church, instead of forbidding or discouraging, rather countenanced and promoted Bible-reading in the Middle Ages.

As long as Christians read and studied the Scriptures in the true, proper spirit, as pious Jews of old read the Law and the Prophets, with the aim and intent of admiring God's wisdom, of listening obediently to His voice, and making of His words a help to holiness of life, the Church never dreamt of "chaining the Bible" (as the stereotyped lying phrase has it), or preventing her children from its perusal. But when those men rose up, of whom prophetic Scripture had given warning, who<sup>2</sup> would not hear Christ or His Church, but despised Him and His Heavenly Father in their duly commissioned representatives (to use His own words<sup>3</sup>), who lifted themselves up above Scripture and subjected it to their own rule and caprice, as if it were not God's Word, but their own, and made of it not only their property but

<sup>1</sup> Claudian.

<sup>2</sup> In the last days there shall come scoffers, with deceit walking according to their own lusts. . . . Who walk after the flesh . . . and despise government, audacious, pleasing themselves, they fear not to bring in sects, blaspheming. . . . As irrational beasts, naturally tending to the snare and to destruction, blaspheming those things which they know not. . . . Forsaking the right way, they have gone astray. . . . Fountains without water and clouds tossed with whirlwinds. . . . Speaking swelling words of vanity, they allure in desires of the flesh of riotousness those who had escaped . . . promising them liberty, when they themselves are slaves of corruption. . . . Who defile the flesh, and despise dominion, and blaspheme majesty. . . . Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion, wandering stars. . . . Murmurers, full of complaints, walking according to their own desires, and their mouth speaking proud things, . . . mockers, walking according to their own desires in impieties, . . . who separate themselves, sensual men, not having the spirit. . . . Men who wrest (not only St. Paul's Epistles, but also the other) Scriptures to their own perdition (2 Peter ii. 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19; iii. 3, 16; Jude 8, 13, 16, 18, 19). Could there be a more lively picture of Luther and his rabble rout of sensual friars, rushing from their convents, not only "to walk after the FLESH," but to mock the Christian people by proclaiming it (the freedom of the flesh) from the pulpit as the perfection of Gospel liberty—speaking swelling words of pride against the Catholic Church, and blaspheming her doctrines and mysteries, of which they understood nothing—and finally perverting Paul, John, and Matthew (as they irreverently called them) to the eternal ruin of their own souls, and those of their unwary hearers.

<sup>3</sup> Luke x. 16.

their plaything, altering (as it happened to suit them) not only the meaning but the very text of the Divine Message—then, and only then, did the Church interfere. Reverence for God's Word, which they so shamefully misused, and zeal for the welfare of the souls intrusted to her care, pointed out the course she had to take; and had she not discharged her responsibility by taking it, she would have been inexcusable before God and man. Accordingly she forbade the circulation and reading of all Bibles translated by heretics, that is, those who "had separated themselves and brought in sects," and allowed only those which had been made by approved interpreters, and were furnished with orthodox notes to explain doubtful passages, or such as were most liable to be misunderstood by ordinary readers. Such was the legislation of the great Council of Trent. In purely Catholic countries, where they are no longer needed, some other formalities attached to this general law yet remain in force. But, strange to say, in mixed countries, where they would seem to be more needed, they have become obsolete. At all events, Catholics may thank heresy, and not the Church, for any restrictions laid on their reading the Bible in the vernacular.

But it may be urged, if there were, at least proportionately to the times, many vernacular versions in the Middle Ages, what has become of them? How is it that so few have survived? The true answer may perhaps (it certainly ought to) bring a blush to the cheek of those who are in the habit of putting such questions. In the first place it must be said that most of these books, like a thousand other precious remains of classical and mediæval literature, were wickedly and wantonly destroyed. Destroyed? And by whom? Not by the monks, surely. Who could imagine, for example, that the monks of St. Gall would knowingly make away with the German *Job* of their confrere Notker, of which not a fragment has come down to us. Was it, then, the work of Bishops or Inquisitors who ransacked church archives and monastic libraries in search of Bibles, to consign them to the flames? It is not likely; and no one has dared assert it, not even such unscrupulous romancers, or enemies of truth rather, as Fox and D'Aubigné. And even had they set out in quest of Bibles to burn, they would have singled them out, and not destroyed indiscriminately with them missals, breviaries, Prayer-books, Lives of the Saints, Holy Fathers, etc. Who then, were the true culprits? The answer is plain. It was the Vandalic hordes of the Reformation, who desecrated the Catholic shrines and churches, pillaged and burnt the archives and libraries of cathedrals and monasteries in Germany, the Low Countries, and Switzerland, and France, in the fury of their reforming zeal. They were filled with the spirit and acted on the principle of the Mohammedan Omar when he burnt the libraries of Christian Alex-

andria, in which were hoarded up the priceless treasures, never to be regained, of the old classical world. They verified to the letter the saying of Erasmus, that the pretended Reformation of religion was only another name for the destruction of all literature.<sup>1</sup> Lutheranism, as he judged it simply by its results, was synonymous with "interitus literarum," the ruin of literature. A mere memorandum (of transfer of ownership for example) in one of these MSS., if accompanied by the sign of the Cross, as was usual in such documents, was enough to consign it to the flames or to mutilation. How will our non-Catholic friends account for and explain in a logical way, that will be satisfactory to their conscience, this unearthly hatred of the sign of the Cross, the Cross which was our redemption, as St. Paul tells us? Catholics need no information nor explanation on the subject, for they have been taught by Scripture, and by a thousand examples in Church history, that the Devil hates and fears the sign of the Cross, which dispossessed him of the empire he once held over this world, and is only too glad to avail himself of human agency in insulting and persecuting it. It is only the Church of Christ and her arch-enemy who understand what the Cross truly means. For both of them it is the

Arbor decora et fulgida,  
Ornata Regis purpura,  
    . . . . .cujus brachiis  
Pretium pendit sæculi,  
Statera facta corporis  
Tulitque prædam Tartari.<sup>2</sup>

But this knowledge excites in them very different emotions. In her it awakens love and undying reverence; in him it produces hatred and a desire of revenge. And, what is most deplorable, he finds in so-called Christians, outside of the Catholic Church, willing tools to aid him in his work of hatred and revenge.

It is probably to those reforming vandals that we owe the loss of the works of Ennius and Varro, Cicero's treatises *de Consolatione* and *de Gloria*, the missing Decades of Livy, and a hundred other treasures of untold worth that have hopelessly perished through their wicked hands. Many of these were known to exist some years before the Reformation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Ubi regnat Lutheranismus, ibi est literarum interitus." "The prevalence of Lutheranism brings with it the destruction of all literature."

<sup>2</sup> Processional Hymn of Venantius Fortunatus used by the Church in her office of Passiontide.

<sup>3</sup> Hugh S. Legaré, in an article written some fifty years ago in the "Southern Review," and republished in his works (Charleston, 1845, vol. ii. p. 226), speaking of palimpsests or *codices rescripti*, says, "Who shall balance the account between what was saved by the liberal and what was destroyed by the ignorant or bigoted zealot,

The devastation wrought in libraries on the Continent of Europe was generally the work of ruffians, whose hands were armed, who were flushed with military as well as religious excitement, drunk with victory which had been purchased by their blood. And this, though it cannot justify, may extenuate in some way, or at least explain their wicked deeds. But in England it was *organized vandalism*, deliberately set on foot by civil tribunals and legal commissions. Let any one read Anthony Wood's account of their doings, when they visited Oxford and its colleges. Any manuscript that had on it a cross or other religious emblem was torn to pieces, and the fragments scattered to the winds. Many books of mathematics were treated in the same way, because the figures were supposed to be "Popish" emblems of devotion. The rest were carted away and sold for waste paper. The monastery of Malmesbury had a collection of MSS., perhaps the finest in England. The house was ravaged and plundered of all its contents by Henry's minions, or commissioners so called, and not one was left. Years after, an antiquary who travelled through the town of Malmesbury, relates that he saw broken windows patched up with remnants of the most valuable MSS. on vellum, and that the bakers had not even then consumed the stores they had accumulated, in heating their ovens.<sup>1</sup> From Merton College alone an immense quantity, almost a wagon-load of MSS. was carried off. Here is the testimony of an eye-witness. Some MSS. they sold "to grocers and soap-sellers, and some they sent over the sea to the bookbinders, not in small number, but at times whole ships full. Yea, the universities of

---

between the copies made and the MSS. effaced by monks and priests? At all events, a general search-warrant ought to go forth against every inch of parchment occupied by the Gregorys and the Ambroses, the Jeromes and the Chrysostoms. There is probable cause enough for this grand *conceptio furti*." It would be more to the point to issue a writ, summoning into the court of this nineteenth century the ghosts of those religious Goths and Vandals, who, in the name of Protestantism, ransacked, pillaged and burnt the libraries of Europe three hundred years ago. But even could they be made to appear, we should be none the wiser. They could be made to confess that they had destroyed and burnt, but *what* they destroyed and burnt they could never tell. Possibly the very works of Varro, the Origines of Cato, the lost poems of Menander and Alceus, to which Mr. Legaré subsequently refers. The monk's palimpsest was in itself no crime against the republic of letters. If he effaced a Pagan MS. it was only with the view of replacing it by what he considered more useful. He may have been mistaken, but an error of judgment (granting it to be such) is no crime. For the Reformers' wanton barbarism there can be no excuse. But Mr. Legaré, though a learned man in other respects, knew little of the history of Protestant vandalism. Indeed, it has yet to be written. And it would be a subject worthy the attention of a good scholar.

Mr. Legaré was a good and great man, a classical scholar of the highest attainments, and a writer of no ordinary power. But, unfortunately for his reputation, he was born outside of New England, and, therefore, the American public knows little or nothing about him.

<sup>1</sup> Maitland's Dark Ages. London, 1853, p. 281.



this realm are not all clear of this detestable fact. I know a merchantman that bought the contents of two noble libraries for forty shillings. This stuff he has used instead of gray paper for more than ten years, and he has enough for ten years to come."<sup>1</sup>

But this vandalism, it will be said, and Dr. Cunningham Geikie is bold enough to say it, was not the work of the Reformers. Not the work of their hands, it may be, but of their wicked tongues. They encouraged it and put a premium on it. Here is a case in point, and from their own official records. In the "Fourth National Synod of the Reformed Churches of France, held at Lyons, on the 10th of August, 1563, third year of the reign of Charles IX., King of France, M. Pierre Viret, pastor of the church at Lyons, being moderator," among other things that came up for discussion and decision, was the case of an apostate Abbot (*qui etait parvenu a la conoissance d l'evangile*, in plain English, who had learned to appreciate the new gospel and its liberty of the flesh), who applied for admission to the Lord's Supper. Some doubts of his orthodoxy having been suggested, evidence was brought that he had pulled down the idols (pictures) of his church, forbidden the chanting of mass in his convent, *burnt its records*, and borne arms in defence of the Gospel. On hearing this, every doubt as to his thorough Calvinism vanished, and he was admitted to the Lord's Supper. The summary of this fact, as given in the Index to the Synod, is so quaint and expressive, that it is worth transcribing:

"Abbe recu a la cene *pour avoir brule ses tiïres*, abatu les images (in the acts of Synod, they are called *les idoles*), de l'eglise de son convent, et porte les armes pour maintenir les predicateurs Reformes."<sup>2</sup>

To come back to our main point, mistranslation of the Bible was never known in the Christian Church, save in the case of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, down to the days of modern heresy.

<sup>1</sup> Bale, as quoted by Rev. Cunningham Geikie, in the "English Reformation." New York, 1879, p. 343. Bale (Balæus) was a renegade Carthusian friar, a "monstrum Carthusianum," as Luther styled one of the same cloth, the court-parson of Hesse, by whose evangelical exhortations Margarite von der Sale was seduced into the belief that she ought to become the *additional* wife of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse. Bale's polemical works are a thorough sink of lewd, filthy ribaldry, which disclose the true character of the early English Puritans. His writings, as far as they are historical, are a mass of unparalleled mendacity. The Protestant Wharton says of him, that he is so unscrupulous a "liar" that no statement can be taken on his unsupported testimony. But Bale always lied for a purpose, and in the interest of his sect. When it is otherwise his testimony may be relied on. In the present case he is a good witness against his own crew.

<sup>2</sup> Abbott N. N. admitted to the Lord's Supper, "*because he had burnt his (abbey) records, pulled down the pictures of his convent church, and borne arms in support of the reformed Preachers.*" Aymon, apud Maitland, Dark Ages, p. 500.

We speak not of faulty translation, which may spring from error or incompetency, and which may consist with innocence. We speak of mistranslation in its strict literal and moral sense, a false rendering that originates in malice, and cannot be conceived, unless accompanied by deliberate deadly sin. And what is malice? Cicero's definition is quite to the purpose. It is "the doing of wrong (or harm) with cunning and deceit."<sup>1</sup> The Reformers, in their translations, were guilty of all this. Their "cunning" was shown by their pretext of having recourse to the original texts in order to give the world a purer and better version than the Catholic Vulgate. The "deceit" consisted in altering and falsifying the sense of those originals under cover of translation. Of the *objective* harm they wrought, it is useless to speak. No human calculation can reach it; nor will its depths ever be fully sounded until the great Judgment day. We speak now of harm as Cicero does, *subjectively*, that is, as far as the doing of harm lay in their mind and intention. They certainly *meant to injure* their disciples and followers, for their deliberate purpose was to delude them, to lead them into error, error that affects the eternal interests, for weal or woe, of redeemed souls. Their intention, further, was to injure the Catholic Church and her divinely established teaching ministry, by representing her doctrine as unscriptural, by artfully excluding it from the text when found there, or by adroitly foisting their own opinions into the text, which originally, as it came from the mouth of inspiration, did not contain them. We see in them, therefore, every feature of that *versuta et fallax nocendi ratio*, which constitutes malice. With all of them this *malice* was a matter of habitual practice; with some of them, as we shall see, it was elevated to the rank of a principle.

As Luther was the great standard-bearer of religious revolt against Church authority, so he was also the father and founder of the school of mistranslation. We give a few specimens of the arbitrary way in which he dealt with the text, when it ran counter to his heretical notions. When he was a Catholic, he believed that penance was a sacrament, and had three essential parts, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, or, as it is technically called, "penance." After leaving the Church, he retained the two former, after a fashion, but discarded the third. Accordingly he determined to put it out of the Bible, as well as out of his creed. Hence, in Matthew iii., 2, he disfigures the exhortation of the Baptist, rendering the word μετανοείτε (*do penance* or *repent*), by the German words, "bessert euchr" (*mend* or *do better*). Now, the context is directly against this translation, for it shows that penance is not simply a

<sup>1</sup> "Est enim malitia versuta et fallax nocendi ratio." Cic. de Nature Deorum, lib. iii. § 30.

state of mind (though Luther and his Puritan followers seem to have confounded it with faith or a man's *belief* in the remission of his own sins). It is, according to Catholic doctrine, a state of mind that necessarily shows its sincerity by outer works, making some atonement to God's offended justice, punishing the guilty flesh for what it has done, and bringing it into subjection (as St. Paul says), lest it be tempted to repeat the offence. These are what St. Matthew, in the same chapter (iii. 8), calls "fruits worthy of penance (or repentance)." And when our Lord speaks of what theologians call the "futurible" penance of the Tyrians and Sidonians, He calls it penance, or a thorough change of soul, which they would have manifested by satisfaction or self-punishment, by clothing themselves with sackcloth and lying in ashes (Matthew xi. 21). Luther himself knew better, and in a moment of forgetfulness translates the same phrase *μετενοησαν* (the Ninivites *repented* or *did penance*), by the words, "sie thaten Busse," "they did penance." It is needless to add, that the "bessert euch" has disappeared from modern editions of the Lutheran Bible, and has been replaced by "Thut Busse," "Do penance." Whether this change was owing to Luther's own good sense, or that of subsequent editors, we cannot say, for the literary history of Luther's Bible has yet to be written. One thing is certain. In the beginning of his reforming career, he mistranslated Matthew iii. 2, in order to remove from the text the Catholic idea of penance or satisfaction which was in it, from the context and the unanimous interpretation of all the Fathers of the Church. His correct translation of Matthew xii. 41, shows that his mistranslation of Matthew iii. 2, was deliberate, and had its origin in malice.

Luther, growing wiser in his own conceit after some time, rejected from the sacrament of Penance, not only satisfaction but *confession* likewise. The necessity of confession, like some of the Catholic doctrines,<sup>1</sup> is clearly laid down in the unwritten word (*Verbum Dei traditum*), but is not so clearly defined in the written word (*Verbum Dei scriptum*). This is very natural, for the Scripture is not, what some imagine, a Catechism or Rule of Faith, or Summary of Christian doctrine. It contains, no doubt, a great deal of Catholic doctrine, but only what the *occasional* writing

<sup>1</sup> And some Protestant doctrines too: for example, the sanctification of the Lord's day. There is not a word in the New Testament about this precept, which rests solely on the authority of the Apostles, preserved for us by the tradition of the Catholic Church. The persistent attempt of some, to call it the "Sabbath," is unchristian and blasphemous, but it shows the disposition to reject Apostolic and Catholic authority, and fall back on the Old Testament or Jewish code, for a sanction of the day's observance. The "open Bible" and the "Sabbath" (the one never commanded, the other positively abolished by Almighty God), are the two idols, that the non-Catholic world has adopted in exchange for the "idolatry" of Romanism.

called for, whether it was the narration of facts, or the giving of admonition, rebuke and special precepts. But the duty of disclosing one's sins, as a necessary accompaniment of repentance, is more than once laid down, indirectly, at least, and in general terms (Matthew iii. 6; Mark i. 5; Acts xix. 18; James v. 16). But after awhile Luther was pleased to retain only the first part, which he confounded in some absurd way with faith, or *fiducia*, and to reject the second as a restraint upon what he called Gospel liberty, but to which the Catholic theologians of that day, and impartial history since, have given quite another name. In conformity with his usual plan, he seized the first opportunity to throw out the correct meaning of a text (Acts xix. 18) which had been confidently appealed to by Catholic theologians in support of the ancient doctrine. St. Luke says that many Jews and Gentiles, moved by the preaching and miracles of the Apostles, and by the Devil's failure to work false wonders in opposition, were filled with wholesome fear, believed, and came to the feet of the Apostles, confessing and telling their sins "εξομολογούμενοι και αναγγελλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν," or, as St. Jerome well has it, "confitentes et annuntiantes actus suos," and after him the Douay "confessing and declaring their deeds." How did Luther manage to eliminate the Catholic doctrine from the text? By referring the αὐτῶν to the Apostles, and the "deeds" to their signs and wonders.<sup>1</sup> He translates "sie bekannten ihre Wunderwerke" ("they acknowledged their miracles"), though πρασσω and πραξις were used of "evil deeds" by the good thief on the cross (Luc. xxiii. 41), and the context, taken in connection with the use of εξομολογούμενοι in the parallel places of Matthew iii. 6 and Mark i. 5, and James v. 16, can point to nothing else than the "confession of sins." Luther's disciples again blushed (and this is something) for their master's sacrilegious boldness, and tore out of the text his wicked perversion. It now reads "und bekannten und verkundigten was sie ausgerichtet hatten."

It is impossible to go over the "one thousand and forty"<sup>2</sup> errors and perversions of the text, deliberately made by Luther, in his translation. Neither time nor the means are at hand, as we have not a set of early editions which will enable us to trace those in which his corruptions of the sense were inserted and those in which they were removed by his own sober second thought, or by his successive disciples. We can only give a few specimens. One of

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Karl Werner's *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur der christlichen Theologie* Schaffhausen, 1865, vol. xiv. p. 183.

<sup>2</sup> Such is precisely the number assigned by Emser, in his preface to German New Testament.

the cardinal doctrines of Luther, urged by him especially, and in the most forcible language, from 1521 to 1525 (the date of his own marriage, after which it utterly ceased), was the impossibility of continence or a chaste life. His phraseology, both in Latin and German, was not only impious and unchristian, but so vile, indecent and downright brutish, that it cannot be reproduced on paper before Christian eyes. Yet his filthy pamphlets, handling this point, were (by the kind offices of his friends) circulated everywhere in Germany, not only amongst the common people, but even through monasteries and convents. The crop of wantons that issued from their gates, clamoring for the liberty of the flesh, proved how well, and in what ripe soil, this enemy, the *inimicus homo* prophesied in the Gospel (Matthew xiii. 28), had sown his tares. It was in the Wartburg that he prepared his translation of the Bible, and it was there that he gave expression to the most shameful points of his reforming doctrine. Thence it was that he wrote his famous letter to Melanchthon, with the unblushing words "Esto peccator et peccata fortiter sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo. . . . Peccandum est quamdiu hic sumus. . . . Ab hoc (Agnō Dei) non avellet nos peccatum etiamsi millies millies uno die fornicemur aut occidamus."<sup>1</sup> It was in the same solitude, as he tells us, that he lived, "a prey to the raging fires of his untamed flesh."<sup>2</sup> This candid confession to his "alter ego," Melanchthon, will enable us to judge of the dispositions with which he approached the translation of those passages of the New Testament which have reference to celibacy, etc.

In 1. Cor. ix. 5, where the Apostle speaks of scandal, to which he and Barnabas would give no occasion, though for this purpose they waived an undeniable right, he asks: Have we not a right to take with us in our journeyings a woman of the Christian sisterhood, whose matronly care will free us from all solicitude about the necessities of daily life? Or as the words go, "Have we not power to lead about (to take with us in travelling) a sister, a woman, like the other Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?" The word *γυνή* in Greek means "woman" in general, and sometimes also "wife," exactly like the French word "*femme*." This must be, and may always be safely determined by the context. Here the context evidently implies, not a wife, but a woman chosen from the Christian sisterhood or body (otherwise why refer to her

<sup>1</sup> "Be a sinner and sin bravely, but trust more bravely, and rejoice in Christ. . . . We must sin as long as we are in this world. . . . From this Lamb of God (who takes away the sins of the world, and whom it is enough for us to know), no sin can separate us, even though we should commit fornication and murder a thousand thousand times a day." Luther's Briefe (De Wette), Berlin, 1826, tom. ii. p. 37. The attempt to give a mystical or esoteric sense to these words, is too contemptible for notice.

<sup>2</sup> *Quin carnis meæ indomitæ magnis uror ignibus.* Ibid. p. 22.

by the name of *sister*?) who would free them from all earthly solicitude in their apostolic journeys. The other Apostles did this without scruple, strong in their own innocence and the unbounded veneration of their flocks. But St. Paul and (under his guidance) Barnabas, for peculiar reasons, to avoid all shadow of evil report, abstained from doing what was perfectly lawful and blameless in itself. All modern heretical versions (in order to countenance a married clergy) have rendered *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα* by "a sister, a wife." But Luther, bolder than them all, removes every probability of doubt, by *commenting* the text under cover of translation. He renders the words by "eine schwester ZUM Weibe" "for a wife" or "as a wife," thus forcing his own filthy conceit into the mouth of the inspired Apostle, by whom it was never uttered. This wicked perversion has not been removed from Luther's Bible, but remains there yet.

In 1 Timothy iii. 12, the Apostle, taking into consideration the state of the times, when seminaries and clerical education had not yet commenced, lays it down as a condition for the choice of deacons, that none shall be ordained who have been married more than once. "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife." Luther saw his chance, and turned what the Apostle had made a negative condition into an imperative obligation. This he did by his usual artifice of inserting words in the translation which are not found in the text. His version is "Die Diener, lass EINEN JEGLICHEN seyn eines Weibes Mann." "As to the ministers (deacons), let EACH ONE be the husband of one wife." It is needless to say that the words "einen jeglichen" are not in the original,<sup>1</sup> but were a gratuitous addition of Luther's. This corruption likewise remains to this day. In the preceding verse he had made use of a similar artifice. St. Paul had said, speaking of women who were connected with the service of the Church in any way, deaconesses, consecrated widows, or religious, "The women in like manner chaste." As if the better to explain his intention, he leaves *γύναικες* without the article *αἱ*. But Luther, followed in this by the Anglican version, translates "Desselligen gleichen IHRE WEIBER sollen ehrbar seyn," "Like themselves, THEIR wives shall be grave."

<sup>1</sup> Διάκονοι ἐστῶσαν μίας γυναῖκος ἀνδρες.

<sup>2</sup> In King James's Version, "Even so must THEIR WIVES be grave." We see no good reason why *σεμναι* should not be translated "chaste," as was done by St. Jerome. But "nescio qua teneritudine hæreticorum aures tenentur," if we may be allowed to parody the words used on another occasion by the same great saint. It was so translated in the early Syriac version, *nacphon*, which is rendered "chaste" by Dr. Murdoch in his "Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito," New York, 1879, p. 382. But on what principle of translation did Dr. Murdoch give us this strange rendering of the verse following: "Let the deacons be such as HAVE EACH one wife." Where did he find these two words in his original? They are not in any known copy in print or manu-

Heresy, being an inspiration of the fallen Archangel, has a natural tendency to hate and disparage those friends of God, who though born of dust, were called to fill the thrones from which himself and his rebel host had been driven, and above all that humble handmaid of the Lord who was called to fill the highest place in heaven, whose foot bruised the infernal serpent's head,<sup>1</sup> and who is hailed by the Church as the vanquisher of all heresies. Hence all modern heresy, with Luther at its head, has done its best to undermine the testimony of Holy Scripture in her favor. Luther translates the *κεχαριτωμένη* of the angel's address (Luke i. 28) by "Du holdselige" (Thou gracious one!) The Vulgate has correctly "*gratia plena*," and so too the Syriac "*maliat taibuto*" (full of grace), which are most probably the identical words in which the angel addressed her, if he used human speech, for this was her native tongue. And these are the very words with which the Church has ever greeted her from that day. Luther contended that instead of "Du holdselige," it would have been better and more German to say "Du liebe Maria" ("Dear Mary!") "Full of grace" he adds, "may be a word-for-word rendering of the Latin; but tell me, is it good German? When does a German ever speak thus: Thou art full of grace? Or what German understands the words, 'full of grace?' He must think of a barrel full of beer or a bag full of money."<sup>2</sup> This ribaldry is quite characteristic of Luther, but is not argument. Nor did it occur to him when he was translating John i. 14, where he considered "full of grace and truth" very good German for "*plenum gratiæ et veritatis*."<sup>3</sup>

---

script. Is it really a matter of necessity, that no one outside of the true Church can put a finger to Scripture, without feeling himself irresistibly impelled to distort its text in favor of his private opinions? It would almost seem so. We give the Syriac verse with its correct translation: "Mshamshone nehwn, aino dahhdo atto hwot leh," "Let the deacons be, he who *has had* one wife" (or in literal rigor, "to whom there *has been* one wife"). And thus it was translated two hundred years ago by a Protestant Syriac scholar, Martin Trostius, whom Dr. Murdoch would have done well to consult now and then. His version is semi-barbarous, but only because it is so literal. Here is his translation of the passage: "Diaconi sint, is cui una *FUIT* uxor." Does not this anticipate all cavil and mistranslation? But then we must remember that the Syriac version was made by honest, God-fearing, Christian men, and not in the interests of *heresy*.

<sup>1</sup> "Quæ caput serpentis virgineo pede contrivit" (Office of Imm. Conception). And in the Officium Parvum, "cunctas hæreses sola interemisti in universo mundo."

<sup>2</sup> "Sage mir aber, ob solchs auch gut Deutsch sey? Wo redet der deutsche Mann also: Du bist voll Gnaden? Und welcher Deutscher verstehet, was gesagt sei, voll Gnaden? Er muss denken an ein Fass voll Bier, oder Beutel voll Geldes" (Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen, in the Erlangen edition of 1855, vol. lxx. p. 112).

<sup>3</sup> Eine Herrlichkeit als des eingebornes Sohnes vom Vater, voller Gnade und Wahrheit. Cf. Luc. ii. 40, "Voller Weisheit," and Luc. iv. 1. Also Acts vi. 3, 5, 8; ix. 36, and other places where Luther has no scruple to use phrases like the one to which he objected in the case of the Blessed Virgin. Verily it might be said to him in good German of his own coining "O du voll aller List und aller Schalkheit!" (Acts xiii. 10.)

It would be impossible to dismiss Luther without some mention of his famous falsifications in the third and fourth chapters of St. Paul to the Romans, where he forced his heretical system upon the unwilling text by thrusting into it, capriciously, when it suited his purpose, the particles *nur* and *allein* (*only, alone*). Thus in iv. 15, instead of the words "the law worketh wrath," he gives us "the law worketh **ONLY** wrath" (*das Gesetz richtet NUR zorn an*); and in iii. 20 for the language of the Apostle "by the law cometh the knowledge of sin," we have the Lutheran crotchet "by the law cometh **ONLY** the knowledge of sin" (*durch das Gesetz kommt NUR Erkantniss der Sünde*).<sup>1</sup> Rom. iii. 23, where the Apostle said, "They have all sinned," Luther translates "They **ARE** all sinners" (*sie SIND alle Sünder*), in order to teach under cover of the Apostle's authority that man's sinfulness is inherent even after justification. In the same chapter, v. 25 and 26, he again falsifies the Apostle's inspired words, by foisting into the text the system he himself had invented. In the former, St. Paul speaks of God's justice inasmuch as it is the *causa formalis* (to use the words of the Council of Trent) of the sinner's justification, not the justice whereby He is Himself just, but whereby He makes us just, where-with once gifted we are changed into new men, and are not only reputed but are called and are truly just. This idea of God's justice, aye its very name, was odious to Luther, as he himself tells us,<sup>2</sup> and he drove it out of the text. Instead of "to the declaring of His justice," he translates "to show forth the justice, *that avails before him*,"<sup>3</sup> thus wickedly fastening upon St. Paul his own false theory of justice, not real but imputed. This is repeated in the next verse, the little word *αὐτοῦ* (His) being once more falsified and magnified into "which avails before him." But Luther's difficulties were not ended by this substitution. The next verse, 20th, openly declares that God is just and *makes just*. But no text, however clear, could stand in the way of this bold, unscrupulous monk. If Paul did not agree with him, he would compel agreement or submission. By the dextrous use of his pet word *allein*, he forces St. Paul to speak like a Lutheran. In place of "that He Himself may be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith," etc., he translates "that He **ALONE** may be just, and make just him who," etc. (*auf dass er ALLEIN gerecht sey und gerecht mache den, etc.*). The magical little word overthrows the Catholic doctrine of the Apostle and teaches Lutheranism. For if God alone

<sup>1</sup> This last corruption is no longer found in Luther's Bible. It has disappeared since the year 1530. But it may be seen, says Dollinger, in every copy printed from 1522 to 1529. "Die Reformation," Regensburg, 1848, vol. iii. p. 140.

<sup>2</sup> "Diesem Wort, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, war ich sehr feind." Walch's Ed., xiv. 460.

<sup>3</sup> "Damit er die Gerechtigkeit, die vor ihm gilt, darbierte."



is just, His making man just means nothing more than imputed or fictitious justice.

But perhaps bolder still was his attempt on verse 28, where with impious deliberation he forces into the mouth of the Apostle his own doctrine, that man is justified by faith alone. St. Paul says, "For we account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law." This Luther shamelessly renders: "We hold that a man is justified without works of the law, by faith ALONE" (ohne des gesetzes werke ALLEIN durch den glauben). He is, if possible, more unscrupulous in verse 6 of the next chapter, where again he intrudes his doctrine into the text. St. Paul says, "As David also termeth the blessedness of a man to whom God reputeth justice without works." This Luther translates, "After which fashion David likewise saith that blessedness belongs ONLY to the man to whom God imputes justice, without *the aid* (or co-operation) of works." "Dass die seligkeit sey ALLEIN des Menschen, welchem Gott zurechnet die Gerechtigkeit, ohne ZUTHUN der Werke." Here blessedness (or God's friendship) is made to consist *only* in imputed justice, and the co-operation of good works is positively excluded. Supposing even that this were Paul's opinion, why put it into his mouth, where he never expressed it? Supposing him to have held the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this point, as she has ever taught and insisted, can madness and impiety be carried to a farther extent than to compel him, by mistranslation, to teach and preach the contrary of what he actually believed? Luther knew and confessed that the whole Christian world for fifteen hundred years had understood St. Paul in a different sense. He, therefore, in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans, cautions his readers, that if they would understand the Apostle correctly, they must pay no attention to the way his teaching had been explained by Thomas, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose and others still higher (this is a fling at an inspired Apostle, St. James), but must follow implicitly his (Luther's) interpretation. This is arrogant enough, but for fear it might not suffice to persuade his hearers, he deliberately changes the text of the Apostle to bring it into conformity with his new theories. Is there any plea that can be alleged in justification of this conduct? Was it zeal for the truth? A consciousness of profounder knowledge of God's revelation and the Apostle's meaning? Does it not on the contrary betray malice, the *versuta et fallax nocendi ratio* of which Cicero speaks, a wicked deliberate attempt to injure the Catholic Church and injure his readers by misleading them, to their eternal ruin?

The whole Christian world was stirred to indignation by these barefaced attempts of Luther to pervert the meaning and corrupt the text of Scripture. But in what spirit did he listen to those

protests? Did he offer excuse or apology? Far from it. He replied with insolent defiance, and only regretted that he had not made fuller and more sweeping changes in the text. His answer gives such an insight into the man's character, that we cannot withhold a few extracts:

"You may tell your Papists on my behalf, if you choose, that had I foreseen that all Papists put together were smart enough to translate correctly even one chapter of Scripture, I would have had the humility to ask their aid and help in translating the New Testament. But as I know and see plainly, that none of them know how to translate or speak German, I spared them and myself the trouble. . . . In the next place you may say, that I have translated the New Testament to the best of my power and according to conscience (!), have compelled no one to read it, but left it to his choice. . . . No one is forbidden<sup>1</sup> to make a better (translation). Whoever will not read it may let it alone. . . . It is MY Testament and MY translation, and MINE it shall be and remain. If I have committed any fault in it,—though I am not conscious of it, and would not willingly mistranslate even one letter (!),—I will not tolerate Papists as my judges. Their ears are too long, and their Ika Ika (braying) is too weak to judge my translation." . . .

"But to come back to the point, if your Papist annoys you with the word *sola* (ALLEIN, only) tell him straightway: Dr. Martin Luther will have it so—Papist and ass are one and the same thing. *Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas.*<sup>2</sup> For we will not be scholars and disciples of the Papists, but their masters and judges. We'll bully and brag with these dunces, and as Paul boasts against his crazy saints, so will I boast against these asses of mine. Are they doctors? So am I. Are they learned? So am I. Are they preachers? So am I. Are they theologians? So am I. Are they disputers? So am I. Are they philosophers? So am I. Are they dialecticians? So am I. Are they teachers (Legenten)? So am I. Do they write books? So do I. And I will boast further. I can interpret Psalms and Prophets; they cannot. I can translate; they cannot. I can read the Holy Scripture; they cannot. I can pray; they cannot. And to come down, I know their dialectics and philosophy better than all of them put together. And I know, too, that not one of them understands their Aristotle. And if

<sup>1</sup> Yet Luther took good care to procure edicts from the German Protestant princes to forbid the printing and circulation of Emser's German (Catholic) New Testament. See his letter to John, Duke of Saxony, and another to Henry, Duke of Mecklenburg, in De Wette, *Luther's Briefe*, iii. 528, 529, or in the Erlangen ed. of *Luther's Works*, vol. liv. pp. 112, 113.

<sup>2</sup> "Thus will I, thus command I, and for reason stands my will,"—a line of the poet, Juvenal.

there be one among them all that rightly understands preface or chapter in Aristotle, I will let them toss me in a blanket. I am not saying too much; for from my youth up I have been educated in all their arts. They know well that I know everything they know. Yet these godless people deal with me as if I was a stranger to their profession, who had only arrived this morning, and had never seen or heard what they teach or know. . . . By way of answer to their prattle and outcry I must sing with that wench, "Full seven years ago I knew that horseshoe nails were made of iron."

"Let this be the answer to your first question, and I beg of you to give such asses (in reply to their silly talk about the word *alone*), no other answer than this: Luther will have it so, and he is a doctor above all doctors in Popedom. This ends the matter. I will henceforth despise and hold them in contempt as long as they are such people (asses I mean) . . . How much art and labor are needed for translation, I know well by experience; hence I will allow no Pope-ass nor mule to judge or blame me. Whoever will not have my translation, let him give it the go by; the Devil's thanks to him, who censures it without my will and knowledge. If it has to be censured I will do it myself. If I do not, let my translation be left in peace, and let each one do for himself what he will, and so good-bye to him. This I can testify with a good conscience, that I have used the utmost fidelity and diligence therein and have never had a thought of falsehood . . . If the daubers and Pope-asses abuse me, pious Christians, with Christ their Lord, praise me, and I am richly rewarded, if even one Christian account me a faithful laborer. I care not for the Pope-asses, they are not worthy to appreciate my work, and were they to praise me, it would grieve me to the bottom of my heart. Their abuse is my highest glory and honor. I will still be a doctor, yea, an uncommon doctor, and this name they never shall take from me down to the last day; of this I am sure. . . . Translation is an art that is not within reach of every one, as these crazy saints imagine. For it there is needed a right pious, truthful, diligent, reverent, Christian, learned, practiced, experienced heart; hence I hold that no false Christian nor sectarian can translate honestly."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Darumb halt ich, dass kein falscher Christ noch Rottengeist TREULICH dolmet-schen könne." This candid acknowledgment, that it is hopeless to expect faithful translation from sectarian hands, almost makes us forget or forgive Luther's arrogant assumption (in the preceding clause) of all the virtues required in a good translator. Thus does divine wisdom elicit truth, not only from the mouths of innocent children (Ps. viii. 2) but even of reluctant enemies. Little did Luther imagine the importance of the principle here laid down. It is a Catholic principle as far as the theory goes. In his mouth it is a shameful confession, a terrible instance of involuntary self-accusa-

Luther then proceeds to justify his additions to the text in the Epistle to the Romans. He contends first, that these were required by the correct idiom of the German language; and, secondly (what he argues at some length), that they are in perfect accordance with the doctrine of St. Paul. The first reason, even if true, is worthless. For it is not elegance but fidelity that is the chief duty of one who translates Scripture. And Luther acknowledges that more than once he has sacrificed his German rather than depart from the letter of Scripture.<sup>1</sup> But these were places where nothing was to be gained, as the text did not furnish any room for alteration. But where heretical novelties could be introduced, it was done, and the propriety of German idiom was made the pretext. The reason given, however, is not only worthless, but untrue. For several other German interpreters, who understood their native tongue as well as Luther, did not think these additions necessary and left them out, or rather never dreamed of putting them in. We shall not discuss the truth of the second reason alleged. Even had it been distinctly revealed in one or more passages of Scripture, this would be no warrant for gratuitously thrusting it into other passages where the inspired writer does not mention it. This liberty once granted, the Scripture would soon become a very different book from what it was, when it first came from the hands of its Divine Author. But Luther had no certainty. It was only his opinion, and that opinion in direct contradiction with the firm belief of the Universal Church for fifteen centuries and more. This makes his boldness in altering St. Paul's text the more intolerable. He adds another reason, and it was no doubt his true and only one: to commend his own theory about good works, and draw men away from that of the Church. He was compelled to do it, he says, by the danger lest the people should keep hanging on to works, instead of faith, especially at a time when they were so addicted to works that they had to be torn away from them by force, which makes it quite right and even necessary to give out in the clearest and fullest way that faith alone without works justifies.<sup>2</sup>

---

tion and self-condemnation. What was Luther but a sectarian, standing alone against the whole Catholic world, when he set about inventing his religious system? *Solus eram*, as he himself says elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> Ich habe ehe wöllen der deutschen sprache abbrechen, denn von dem Wort weichen. All the foregoing quotations are taken from Luther's "Sendschreiben vom Dolmetschen," which may be found at page 104 of the 65th volume of his works. Erlangen ed. of 1855. We have not (for want of space) added the original German, but the reader may rely on the fidelity of the translation.

<sup>2</sup> "Zwinget auch die Fahr der Leute, dass sie nit an den Werken hangen bleiben und des Glaubens feihlen und Christum verlieren, sonderlich zu dieser zeit, der sie so lang her der Werk gewohnet und mit macht davon zu reissen sind: so ists nit allein recht, sondern auch hoch vonnöthen dass man aufs Allerdeutlichst und Volligsts eraus sage, allein der Glaube ohn Werk macht frumm." Loc. cit.

The thought of the advantage that his theory had derived from the falsification of Scripture, instead of being to him a source of shame and confusion, only begets in him a feeling of regret that he had not intruded into the text some additional words, to establish more firmly by its aid the Lutheran doctrine. "I repent," says he, "not having added, besides, the words *all* (any) and *of all* (of any), viz., without any works of any law, and thus spoken out fully and roundly." And as to the change already made there, he adds: "Therefore it SHALL STAY in MY New Testament (a truer word than Luther meant, for under his manipulation it had ceased to be the New Testament of the Evangelists and Apostles), and though all Pope-asses go raging mad, they shall never get it out."<sup>1</sup>

These passages are not merely specimens of the Reformer's controversial style, or of what Bullinger used to call "*caninam Lutheri eloquentiam*." They betray his true sentiments touching scripture, far better than his professions. He pretended great reverence for God's word, but it was only in as far as he could use it to his advantage, and make it subservient to his own word. His pretended reverence did not prevent him from corrupting and falsifying it when he could. This was not only his practice, but he elevated it, as we have seen, to the dignity of a principle. When the context was such that falsification was impossible, he would (to use his own vigorous expression) *break through* the text rather than submit to giving up his theory. If a passage contradicted his preconceived notions, he haughtily declared that he WOULD NOT ALLOW it to oppose his doctrine. A notable example of this is given in his correspondence with Melanchthon on the true meaning of 1 Tim. v. 12. Luther was determined to abolish celibacy, with what motives may well be imagined. But he had to find some warrant, real or pretended, in the Bible. He gives Melanchthon the result of his investigations, in other words his reasons for the step,<sup>2</sup> and asks for

<sup>1</sup> "Und reuet mich dass ich nit auch dazu gesetzt habe *alle* und *aller*, also ohn alle Werk aller Gesetz, dass es voll und rund herausgesprochen wäre. Darumb solls in meinem Neuen Testament bleiben, und sollten alle Papstesel toll und thöricht werden, so sollen sie mirs nicht heraus bringen." This and the foregoing passages may be found in vol. lxx. of the Erlangen ed., pp. 104, 105, 107, 108, 113, 114, 115, and 118.

<sup>2</sup> See Luther's letters to Melanchthon of August 6th, and September 9th, 1521. The monk's crafty tactics prove his worldly wisdom, if nothing else. In his treatises and pamphlets written in the vernacular, and designed chiefly for the perusal of ignorant, relaxed, carnal-minded priests, monks, and nuns (for they abounded, and without them we should never had the Reformation), he appeals to their passions, and at times in such revolting, beastly language, that the only wonder is that it ever should have been allowed to appear in print. But of these arguments no trace can be found in his letters to Melanchthon, who would have seen through their hollowness and been disgusted by their downright wickedness. To his corrupt fellows of the church and cloister he commends marriage, nay urges it as an obligation induced by imperative laws of nature. To the lay theologian he speaks only of its allowableness and of how far this may be ascertained from Holy Scripture, etc.

his approval or decision to the contrary. He had come, he said, to the conclusion that priests might marry for the sufficient reason that celibacy was established by the Church, and her laws, like all human laws, cannot take away Gospel liberty. But this was only a battle half won. For reasons of his own, the marriage of Religious, bound by vows, lay nearer his heart. And here the passage of St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 12), was a dreadful stumbling-block in his way. For the Apostle speaks of widows consecrated by vow to the service of God who incur damnation by making void their faith pledged to a heavenly spouse. Therefore, according to St. Paul, the penalty of broken vows is damnation, and this presupposes deadly sin. Luther twisted and writhed under the pressure of this text, could find no solution, and was not satisfied with that proposed by Melancthon. In his anguish he wished that Christ were on earth again to explain away these words of His Apostle. But the confidence that HE was right, whatever Scripture might say, supported him in the struggle. His boldness returned, and he saw clearly that he had but one way of escape left, viz., to "make use of the liberty of the spirit, and break through what opposed the salvation of souls."<sup>1</sup>

He soon, urged by the spirit that ruled within him, carried out his purpose of using the "liberty of the spirit" (liberty of the flesh was its true name), and determined that this troublesome text should no longer stand in his way. How he was to get rid of it, was a matter of less importance. He would either set it down as beyond the reach of interpretation by reason of its obscurity, or he would make out that these vows had been made with the liberty of faith, *i. e.*, with the reserved intention of breaking them whenever it might suit "Gospel liberty" to do so. He would not yield to the text, NOR ALLOW IT to stand in the way of his doctrine.<sup>2</sup>

When it is remembered that all English Bibles, translated or rather mistranslated in the interests of modern heresy, are based on the Bibles of Luther and Beza (of whom we shall speak hereafter), the reader will see the propriety of investigating the work and character, the exegetical practice and principles of those interpreters before examining the English translations. When it is question of true merit, it is hard to find a copy which does not fall behind the original. But where all the merit consists in daubing and disfiguring, it is not so difficult.

<sup>1</sup> Ut prope mihi libertate spiritus utendum esse videatur, et PERRUMPENDUM, quid quid obstiterit salutis animarum. De Wette, Luther's Briefe, tom. ii. p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> "Locus ille Pauli de viduis damnatis superest, quem NON PATIAR adversari huic sententiae de lege et fide; neque ei concedam, potius obscurum confitebor, aut sic intelligam, quod illae viduae libertate fidei voverunt." Ibid. p. 49.

## BOOK NOTICES.

COUNTERPOINTS IN CANON LAW: A reply to the Pamphlet, "Points in Canon Law," and to the American Catholic Quarterly Review, of October, 1878. By *Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.* Newark, N. J.: J. J. O'Connor & Co. 8vo., pp. 105.

Here is a formidable pamphlet of over one hundred pages, which Rev. Dr. Smith has thought fit to write in defence of his former book, "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," against the strictures of Rev. Dr. Quigley, of Cleveland, Ohio, in his "Points of Canon Law," and against a critique of the same book, which appeared in our number of last October. The pamphlet is ushered into the world under favorable auspices, bearing on its face the Episcopal *imprimatur* of Dr. Smith's ordinary, and a commendatory preface by one of our most estimable theologians, Rev. Dr. Pabisch, of Cincinnati. Besides this, it is stated in the "Introduction to the Reader," that many valuable suggestions and corrections have been added to the pamphlet by Rev. F. Konings, O.S.S.R., and Rev. Dr. Pabisch, both of whom revised and corrected the MSS., and even the proof-sheets "with great care and trouble." So, in a certain sense, it may be regarded as the joint production of three distinguished divines, whose fame is justly widespread through the country. How far they have succeeded in refuting the points made by Rev. Dr. Quigley, or the criticism of the REVIEW, is freely left to the judgment of the intelligent reader. Passing by for the present the portion that refers particularly to the Cleveland Divine, who is fully competent to argue his own case, we shall devote a few paragraphs to what is said in reply to the REVIEW.

It is well for Dr. Smith and his reputation, that he has listened to good advice, and in undertaking his defence has placed himself, so to speak, in the hands of his friends. It is to their prudent revision, in all probability, that we owe the moderate, good-tempered tone which characterizes his present work. Had he been allowed to conduct his own defence, he might have been tempted to write in an angry strain. His zeal in what he considers the cause of truth, and his extreme sensitiveness not only to reproof, but even to legitimate criticism, might have hurried him into a disregard not only of social propriety, but also of what is due to his own high standing as author and clergyman. In a word, he would or possibly might have substituted abuse for argument, and denounced his critic instead of defending himself. In place of calm discussion, we might have had only angry recrimination and unseemly personalities. There is no reason why this should be so; but it happens only too often, especially when an author has studied his subject so long, so fondly and earnestly as Dr. Smith has done, and has besides a deep, abiding faith, which nothing can shake, in the solidity of his own judgment, and the unfailing accuracy of his own conclusions.

How wisely Dr. Smith has acted in contenting himself with furnishing the arguments, and allowing others to mould his style, will be apparent to any one who has read Dr. Smith's two letters, in defence of his *Elements*, published in the New York *Tablet*, of last November. It is enough to say that they were regarded by his many friends as not written in the best taste, and not likely to add to the reputation of the distinguished author. The argument, excellent as it might be, was buried and lost under its outward coating of angry words and coarseness. It

speaks well for the Doctor, that he has seen his mistake, and intrusted to other hands the task of managing his style, of keeping it within bounds, and preventing it from becoming the vehicle of personal abuse instead of (what it should be) the calm exponent of reasoning and argument. Though his book is mainly a reproduction of his letters, besides omitting whatever could give just cause of offence, he has rewritten his points, before sending them to his fellow-laborers for friendly corrections and a suitable dress. They have done their part, no doubt, in binding up (to use the language of Holy Writ) what was broken, in strengthening what was weak, and in preserving what was fat and strong. But for his own sake we owe them special thanks for having eliminated from his pages every harsh, angry, and abusive word. They have imparted a good share of their own urbanity to the writer. Why did they not go further, and infuse some portion of their own candor into the controversialist?

This is the only fault we have to find with Dr. Smith. He lacks candor. His book has in it a good deal of research and erudition, and bristles with quotations. But it is not always fair and candid, as a book of the kind should necessarily be. Yet without this, controversy can only degenerate into a mere exchange of hostile words which prove nothing, conclude nothing. For what can be proved by appeals made, not to the reason, but to the prejudices or passions of the reader! Dr. Smith has an unpleasant way not only of not stating in its true light the point at issue, but also of not quoting correctly from an author or from his adversary. And in the whole range of controversy there is nothing more annoying, than to have to deal with one who mistakes your point, or garbles what he quotes. These things may happen to Dr. Smith, innocently or inadvertently, in the heat of argument; but they are none the less vexatious to an opponent, and prejudicial to the reader. We must justify what we have said by an example or two.

The author returns to insist that the Council of Baltimore was not approved by Rome, nor even confirmed, except in a very loose way; and that bishops and priests may appeal even now against its decrees to the Holy See. This seemed to us a loosening of the bonds of church discipline, a step towards encouraging bishops and priests to disregard the legislation of Baltimore as having no intrinsic binding force. We added, that we had never heard such doctrine before, save in the mouth of a priest restive under censure; that in his practical strait it was intelligible enough, but that such theory should be propounded by a grave professor and priest in good standing, was very strange. This, he intimates, is an unjustifiable insult, a thinly-disguised comparison between himself and a suspended priest. How can you deal with a man so morbidly sensitive (to call it by a mild name), that he construes every word, even the most innocent, into an insult? There is here no thin disguise, no comparison, but a strong broad contrast between a bad and a good priest, and the good priest is pleased to resent it as an affront! We should unhesitatingly, to-morrow, use the very same language of the most estimable priest or bishop of the country, who should happen to hold this crotchet about Baltimore legislation and tried to convince others of its truth. We wish the reverend gentleman were half as candid as he is sensitive, and could bring himself to abstain from garbled quotation of our words. Here is the way he quotes them in § 23:

"Our last remark relates to this passage of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*: 'We never heard the opinion (of Dr. Smith, that the Baltimore Decrees were not confirmed *in forma specifica*) expressed before, save by some priest who was restive,' etc."



Now, would not every reader suppose that the words in parenthesis were copied from the REVIEW, either in their present connection, or as a statement given elsewhere of Dr. Smith's opinion? Yet it is no such thing. It is a gratuitous interpolation as it stands. No such words are found in the REVIEW, either here or anywhere else; nothing that even faintly resembles them. When we stated the Doctor's opinion, we used merely the following words, "Neither our bishops nor our priests are bound by the Decrees of the Baltimore Councils." The expression "not confirmed in *forma specifica*" does not occur once in the pages of the REVIEW.

It is useless to discuss here the question of confirmation, special or general. For no matter how clear it might be, Dr. Smith would be furnished by canonists with a dozen quirks, quilllets and dodging-places to elude its power and darken its evidence. We merely make a remark for the benefit of the general reader. Most of the subtleties and technicalities of Canon Law apply to those countries where it has subsisted for centuries, and are in great part retained as yet by Rome in transacting ecclesiastical business with those countries. But it is not in the same way or in the same spirit that she deals with the American Church, which is more intimately dependent on her than the Churches of Europe. The ruler's commands to his subjects, when they form a regular code of law, fall into the hands of interpreters, lawyers, and tribunals, till at last by dint of glossing and interpreting, ruling and counter-ruling, they are enveloped in a mist of uncertainty, that often sadly impairs their value and efficiency. But the commands that he gives to those of his own household, to those immediately dependent on him, are very different. There is no reasoning out their meaning, no gloss or commentary. The consequence is that they are readily understood and cheerfully obeyed. We look on the relation of the Pope and his Roman tribunals to the American Church somewhat in this light. We are more closely and intimately connected with him and them, as our spiritual rulers, than are the Churches of Europe. When the Pope commands our bishops and priests to observe inviolably the Decrees of Baltimore, we know what he means, and take him at his word. We do not, certainly ought not, go delving among the Reiffenstuels and Schmalzgruebers for subtleties and quibbles to elude our plain duty of obedience.

Dr. Smith lays it down as a rule that Roman documents "most uniformly use the word *recognoscere*, never the word *confirmare*." This is scarcely correct. It is enough to take up the collection of Provincial Councils of Baltimore, published by Murphy & Co., in 1851, and run over its pages, to discover the contrary. Every Council that contains the document approving its acts and decrees (and they all have it but one, the second, where it was omitted by neglect or carelessness of the editor), has the words "confirm" and "confirmation" repeated over and over again. In the Decree for 1st Council (p. 62), it is used four times. In the Decrees for the 3d Council (p. 145-147), six times. In that for the 4th Council (p. 189), four times. In those of the 5th (p. 226-29), six times. In the 6th we have (p. 254), once, "decreta a Apostolica confirmatione munita," and again, with same phrase somewhat varied, "Apostolica auctoritate sancire et approbare." In Decree of 7th Council (p. 289), *confirmare* twice, as also *probare* twice, and *approbatio* once. Of the others, except the 10th Provincial Council of Baltimore, we have no copy. And from it we may learn the true meaning of *recognoscere* as applied to Decrees of American Councils, whatever may be its technical sense in canonical casuistry. Dr. Smith says, "Every Latin scholar knows that

the word *recognoscere* means simply to *revise*." This is not its only meaning in good Latin, as will appear from any dictionary. Nor would any schoolboy who has read Cicero's Oration, "pro Rege Dejotaro," imagine that the timid orator had presumed to "revise" imperial Cæsar to his face, when addressing him with the words, "Simul acte recognovi." But the question is, what is its meaning in ecclesiastical Latin? The letter of Cardinal Barnabo to the President of the 10th Baltimore Council, would indicate that its meaning does not stop short at revision. He says, that "after an accurate examination of all the acts of that Council (post accuratum omnium, quæ in Synodo gesta sunt, examen), the Sacred Congregation, after commending the zeal of the Fathers for the maintenance of discipline, etc., 'illius decreta censuit esse recognoscenda.'"<sup>1</sup> How will Dr. Smith translate this? "Decided that its decrees were worthy of revision?" What? The result of accurate, complete revision is nothing more than a decision that the acts are entitled to *revision*! *Recognosco* here is clearly the same as *probo* or *confirmo*. And the sequel shows it. For the Cardinal immediately adds, "Which decision of the Sacred Congregation his Holiness kindly confirmed (*confirmavit*) and commanded that the decrees be promulgated and observed throughout the whole Province of Baltimore."

As regards the first Provincial Council of Baltimore in particular, to remove all cavil, it is worthy of remark that Pope Pius VIII., who was a celebrated canonist, of his own full, personal knowledge (to use Dr. Smith's words, p. 12), gave the confirmation of his Apostolic authority to the Decrees of that Council. Cardinal Capellari (afterwards Gregory XVI.) is our witness. In the Decretum of confirmation, he says, that "Whereas, the Sacred Congregation, to throw greater lustre round the Council, and give more stability to its decrees, unanimously asked His Holiness to confirm them by his Apostolic authority; the Holy Father read them, not summarily but thoroughly (*perlegit*), and weighed them in his wisdom (pro summa sua sapientia perpendit), and having confirmed them by his Apostolic authority, commanded that they be observed in all the dioceses of the United States of North America." When we take into consideration that the famous Decree "Quoniam sæpius" (now known as No. 108 of the Second Plenary) was enacted in this Council, the significance of this confirmation becomes apparent. This is the famous Decree about the bishop's power relatively to pastors of souls, viz., that he has power to appoint and to recall them. Had this Decree never been enacted or failed to find its way into the Second Plenary, no one would ever have dreamed of agitating the question, whether an appeal may not lie against the Baltimore legislation, as not confirmed by the Pope, and possibly in conflict with the general law of the Church.

Dr. Smith tries to answer our objections to his having written the Elements in English. And if he had stated them correctly, we should listen to his reasons on the other side and remain open to conviction. But here he is disingenuous, as usual. This is the way in which he quotes our words:

"The QUARTERLY thus states the objection: 'In the first place the book is written in English. And this is a fatal objection. Latin is the language of the Catholic Church, and is likewise, or should be the language of our schools and of our textbooks. Outside of the Catholic Church, the wicked spirit of heresy prompts her enemies to hate the Latin language.'" (Counterpoints, No. 133.)

This is given as one continuous, unbroken quotation from the Quarterly. The third sentence has no connection with the two that preceded it, and very likely his amiable intent was to make it appear, that

the QUARTERLY had written nonsense. What will the reader say when he is informed, that between the second and third sentence (after the word "text-books"), full fifteen lines have been omitted. And yet no sign, not even a dot or two to indicate the break!

The gist of the passages so artfully suppressed was this: "One innovation leads to another. English textbooks of Canon Law will soon lead to dogmatic and moral theology in English, and this will extend to English philosophy in our ecclesiastical seminaries. The acquisition of Latin will be reduced at last to merely enough to read (and, perhaps, partially understand) the Missal and Breviary. And thus, thanks to these wicked innovations, the Latin tongue, the preservation of which is one of the glories of the Roman Church, will fade away and become truly a dead language. It is her language, our Mother's tongue, and, therefore, we all, laity and clergy, should teach our children and our seminaries to love, revere, and cherish it. Let us learn a lesson from our enemies." And here came in very properly the reference to what goes on outside of the Church. But Dr. Smith adroitly tacked it on to the propriety of writing in Latin, in order to put into our mouth the inference, that whoever writes on these subjects in English is impelled by the wicked spirit of heresy. Would he dare to lay his hand on his conscience, and say that there is any such inference contained or implied in our context before it was garbled to suit his purpose? Why, then, does he insinuate it? Yet insinuate it he does, and at great length, by a parade of religious authors who have written in the vernacular, and a series of triumphant questions after their names, inquiring if they were prompted to write in the vernacular by the wicked spirit of heresy? Thus he introduces the venerated names of Cardinal Gousset, Father Perrone, Father Hill, and even of St. Alphonsus, to make out that the REVIEW, by inference at least, charges them with being "prompted by the wicked spirit of heresy." It is hard to deal patiently with this paltry trickery. Luckily Dr. Smith has preserved the sentence on which his charge is based, though he has torn it from its connection. We shall in turn put a question to him: "Are St. Alphonsus, Father Perrone, Father Hill, and the rest, 'enemies of the Church,' 'outside of her pale,' '*haters* of the Latin language?'" We spoke of no others. Then why drag in these honored names to lend color to his false insinuations? Where did we ever say that the spirit of heresy prompted any writer, good or bad, Catholic or heretic, to write in the vernacular on religious subjects? We said it prompts men "outside of the Church," and "her enemies," to hate Latin because it is her language, and we gave this merely as a reason why we should love it. It is a pity that the Very Reverend revisers of his book did not show their concern for his reputation by mending its manners as well as its style.

It is not our purpose to go over again the question of the essential irremovability of *parochi*, especially with such an opponent, whose aim seems to be to darken and hide the truth,

Obscuris vera involvens,

not like the poor Sibyl, because she could not help it, but of a set purpose. We contended that the idea of *parochus* does not necessarily involve that of *irremovability*. If it did, there could be no such thing as a "*parochus amovibilis*." But "*parochi amovibiles*" are recognized by the Council of Trent ("*Concilium Tridentinum admittit parochos amovibiles*," says, expressly, Giraldu), by the Holy See, the Roman Congregations, and by the most distinguished canonists. The chief and

noblest function of a parish priest is to have the charge of souls especially intrusted to his care. All the rest is secondary and trifling. Now, as Giralduus says, in this respect there is no difference between the removable and the irremovable parish priest. "Nulla, quoad animarum curam exercendam, datur differentia inter parochos amovibiles et perpetuos." Dr. Smith, with his usual want of candor, charges the QUARTERLY with maintaining "that *all* parish priests are now removable *ad nutum*." Had he quoted, without garbling, there would have been no room for such an assertion. Here is the way in which he quotes the QUARTERLY. Of its expressions on this score, he says:

"Taken as they stand, they can have but one meaning, to wit, that according to the law or discipline of the Church, irremovability is not only no essential element of the office of parish priests proper, but even that *all* parish priests are at present removable *ad nutum*. In fact, the QUARTERLY expressly asserts this. Here are its words: 'The contrary (*i. e.*, the removability of parish priests) is now the law of the Church.'"

How innocently that little parenthesis, written by Dr. Smith, has crept into its hiding-place between the words of the QUARTERLY! Its object will be seen hereafter. He misrepresents our reasoning in two ways. First, he must surely remember enough of logic to know that when one constructs an argument on the false premises of his adversary, he does not thereby undertake to avouch, nor can he be held responsible for, the truth of the *consequens* (conclusion) but only for the *consequentia* or logical sequence, *i. e.*, the intrinsic connection between premises and conclusion. We argued thus. If essential irremovability had been given to parish priests, when first instituted by the law-making power of the Church, it would follow, since she now recognizes removable parish priests, that she has abrogated her former enactment, and that the contrary is now the law (or discipline) of the Church. This hypothetical conclusion is set down by Dr. Smith as our positive expression. Is this fair and honest?

In the second place, though not logically held to the truth of a hypothetical conclusion based on his premises, we do not refuse to sustain that the proposition "the contrary is now the law of the Church," even in its positive form, is true. What does "the contrary" mean? Here we may see the significance of the little parenthesis, so artfully foisted into the text by Dr. Smith. He would entrap the reader into the belief that the "removability of parish priests" is the contrary. This is not correct. The opposite of "essential irremovability" is not simply "removability," it is "non-essential (or contingent) irremovability." When in natural theology or ethics the question arises, whether the soul be essentially immortal or not, excellent and most Christian authors are to be found who take, some the affirmative, others the negative side. But the latter, by denying its essential immortality, do not thereby undertake to affirm and prove simply its "mortality." They hold that the soul, not being essentially immortal, may be either immortal or mortal, as it pleases God. And, as it has pleased Him, so it happens. The inferior soul in beasts is mortal, and will be annihilated; the souls of higher degree in man *might* possibly, but of a certainty will not be annihilated, immortality having been accorded to them by God's goodness, not as their inherent right, but as His gift, that He might verify His own word: God alone can claim immortality in His own right (*SOLUS HABET IMMORTALITATEM*. 1 Tim. vi. 16). The opinion of these theologians (we need not discuss its probability or improbability) illustrates very well the case before us. There is no such thing as essential irremovability contained in the idea of parish priest. By

denying this we are not limited to holding that they must thereby become all removable. No; they may well be (what their essence allows) either removable or irremovable. Some the Church leaves in the former state; to others (and they are the greater number) she accords the right of irremovability. It is her gift, and no right inherent in the office. Itself and the office are alike the creation of her will and power.

The Reverend author (Counterpoints, No. 154) calls in question our veracity. This is not polite, but we overlook it, though perhaps it should not have been overlooked by the friendly revisers who undertook to reform his controversial style. We stated that Cardinal Soglia recognized such a thing as removable parish priests, and in proof quoted his words, "sive perpetui sive amovibiles parochi sint," and as a necessary precaution, we marked the edition by the place of printing, year, volume, and page. It is rather hard, after this, to be suspected of coining the passage. We are willing to take his word, that it is not found in the Neapolitan edition he cites. He will not take ours, that it is found in that of Bois-le-duc, 1857. Our copy is at his service, or that of any of his friends, that they may verify the quotation, if they will.

Again, speaking of Ferraris, we ventured to say that, looking through our edition, we had not been able to find the words quoted from him by Dr. Smith, viz., "rectores stabiles, perpetui," but that we would admit them on his authority. This acknowledgment, of which no one need be ashamed, elicited only a coarse jocular reply from Dr. Smith, in his Letters, wisely weeded out of the pamphlet by his cautious advisers. Little did we then know of the Doctor's loose style of quotation, or we might have used our eyes to better advantage. It turns out that the word "perpetui" has been dragged up from a distance of eleven paragraphs, and placed by the side of "stabiles," the latter word being in § 3, and the former in § 14. It is true that it makes not much difference in sense, but it is rather unkind to sneer at him, who had accepted it as a *bonâ fide* quotation.

And besides (*quod minime reris*) that staid old German Jesuit, Leurenus, proved a great source of vulgar merriment to the author of the Letters. The Reviewer candidly confessed that he had no copy of Leurenus, and was, therefore, unable to verify the quotations adduced by Dr. Smith. But he ventured to add, that he felt sure they would turn out on examination to be nothing more than reiterations, more or less diffuse, of the Tridentine formula, "perpetuum peculiaremque parochum." The mirth, which this elicited in the Letters, was considered by the revisers too low and indecorous to be retained in the pamphlet, but in its place they have allowed to appear a misrepresentation. In "Counterpoints" (No. 138), it is said that the Reviewer gives three reasons against the correctness of Dr. Smith's statement of the question about essential irremovability. He states them in order (*a, b, c*), and thus quotes the third: "(*c*) that Leurenus does not stand up for the affirmative side." To say nothing of the awkward, improper, and incorrect way in which these words have been dragged out of their natural context, we merely ask a question: Did Dr. Smith really mistake for positive argument on the Reviewer's part, a surmise, a mere guess as to the possible contents of a book he acknowledged never having read? Or did the Reviewer ever say, much less offer as argument, that "Leurenus does not stand up for, etc.?" He knows that the Reviewer never said anything of the kind. But he states it nevertheless, and thus artfully prepares the reader's mind for a future page (Nos. 159, 160) where the disclosure will be made, that this barefaced Reviewer by his own acknowledgment has never read a line of Leurenus. Again, we ask, is this fashion of con-

troverſy fair and honeſt? Would it not be unſeemly in a man, who poſſeſſes nothing but mere worldly honor? Then, what muſt it be in men of our calling, who ſhould aſpire to ſomething higher than the glory of carrying our petty point for the moment by dint of caviſ and ſophiſtry, making light of truth and wounding charity? "*Crede mihi Torquate*" (we muſt ſay with the grand old Pagan philoſopher), "*ad altiora et magnificentiora nati ſumus.*"

The Reverend author inſiſts that the Reviewer has totally miſconceived the meaning of the Tridentine expreſſion, "perpetuum parochum." He ſays that the "perpetuum" means "irremovable." This we never denied, but merely ſtated that the Fathers in their uſe of the word were thinking of ſomething very different from "eſſential irremovability." By theſe words "perpetuum peculiaremque parochum," the privilege (or right as far as it now exiſts) of irremovability was extended to pariſh prieſts—not to all, but to the greater number: This is ſtated by Soglia, Ferraris, and others, whom our author quotes approvingly. But he thinks we are "incorrect" (No. 168) in ſaying that, in paſſing ſuch law, or according ſuch right, the Fathers had in their minds and intended to aboliſh forever the abominable practice of adminiſtering pariſhes through "parochi conductitii" or clerical hirelings. If we have erred, we can plead in our defence the beſt authority. Without falling back on Devoti, Zallinger, Corradi, Barbosa, Pirrhing, or other muſty canoniſts of times gone by, we appeal to an author of our day, whoſe teſtimony Dr. Smith is not likely to reject. Here are his words. After quoting the legiſlation of the Council of Trent on this point, he ſays:

"The law of the immovableneſs of prieſts having the care of ſouls was enacted, as we have juſt ſeen, in order to put an end to the hiring of temporary ſubſtitutes" (Rev. Dr. Smith, *Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore*. New York, 1874. Sect. 25. Irremovability of Pariſh Prieſts, No. 121).

We come to the laſt topic treated of by the reverend author of Counterpoints, viz.: the lawful exaction of voluntary offerings. If there be anything ludicrous in the juxtapoſition of ſuch words, the fault is not ours. Even here he muſt have recourſe to his uſual unſcrupulous mode of quotation. He ſays (No. 186), "Next the QUARTERLY in ſupport of its aſſertion 'that prieſts have no right to claim even *per modum ſtipendii* any offering for baptiſms, etc.,' quotes the words of the Roman Ritual." This putting of words into our mouth which we never uſed, by the help of quotation-marks, is intolerable. Did we or any one elſe attempt it in his caſe, it is very likely that his perceptions of right and wrong would be aroused, and he would denounce it as diſhoneſt. Dr. Smith, we ſay it without any diſpoſition to flatter him, has talent and ability enough to argue his caſe without having recourſe to theſe deſpicable artifiſes, and he ſhould be aſhamed to employ them. Their uſe is not to his credit, and detracts from whatever there may be that is ſound or worthy of conſideration in his argument. We do not tender advice, for probably he would reſent it, but merely throw out a thought which he may ponder with advantage. If it had not been for theſe arts of his, our reply to his reaſoning would not have extended beyond a few paragraphs. Let him in future conſult his own intereſts and thoſe of the reading public by giving his opponent only argument to refute, and allowing him no chance of expoſing trickery.

We never wrote any ſuch paſſage, but on the contrary grant elſewhere that the prieſt's maintenance may furniſh juſt cauſe for fees, etc., limiting it, however, to its due meaning and becoming expreſſion. The giving ſuch alms, when neceſſary (or appointed by authority) "*ad con-*

gruam sacerdotis sustentationem," is the result of duty on the part of the people. They are bound by divine obligation to support him who ministers at their altars; but to say that a priest may and ought to *exact* this, is a needlessly offensive way of stating it. It may suit the dry, heartless style of a canonist, writing in a learned language; it is not the ordinary style of the Church. For one line that she has written in favor of the priest's "claims," she has written a thousand and more "ad coercendam clericorum cupiditatem," to use her own expression. And what is still worse, this talk about the right "to exact" is extended to matters where it cannot possibly exist. Dr. Smith sneers at our calling the practice of exacting a price for burials and funeral service "something wicked and horrible." Let him remember that the words are not ours, but of a Sovereign Pontiff, Alexander III., in the Third Council of Lateran, and reaffirmed in the Fourth Council of Lateran.

The Reverend author contends that "eleemosyna" and "exaction" are not incompatible, because the Fathers of Baltimore in the Decrees (No. 386), speak of alms to be required in certain matrimonial dispensations. This is true, but does not warrant his general inference. And the author himself has told us why, in another of his books (Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, p. 318), "It is a *penance* imposed on the petitioner for the liberty granted by the dispensation." Both in her internal and external forum the Church can exact voluntary actions as a penance. And she exercises this power every day. Will the reverend author call funeral offerings "a penance imposed" by the Church? But let us learn a lesson from the Church, who is wiser and choicer in her speech than some of her thoughtless ministers and her rugged canonists of the *Ferrea vox*, or iron tongue. With them it is ever "rights" and "claims," "demanding," "exacting," and "compelling." How significant and suggestive, on the contrary, how much more in unison with the Gospel we preach in her name, is the word she loves to use, *eleemosyna*? Even when these voluntary offerings are absolutely needed for the due maintenance of her ministers, though an obligation of conscience thereby arises on the part of the Christian people, yet she will not use the harsh words *debt* or *claim*, but holds still to the gentler, softer, original name of *alms*. And though she gives a parish priest full sway in spirituals and the control of temporalities in his church, she will allow no one to be his own judge in this case, but will have the offerings regulated by higher authority: "Illis eleemosynis contenti sint . . . quas ordinarius constituerit," says the Roman Ritual (De Exeq.).

But, besides the "eleemosynæ" approved or appointed by the bishop, are there not other voluntary offerings, depending only on pious custom ("laudabilis consuetudo"), which may be exacted as a right, and recusants compelled to pay by the bishop's court? This is affirmed by our author, after Craisson, who follows Devoti, who follows N. N., etc., who pretends to have got it out of the Council of Lateran, whose decrees charity compels us to hope they never read. To these names the author in his pamphlet adds several; he might have added a great many more. But *cui bono*? He would only succeed in proving that some canonists, like parrots, may repeat each other's words; and like silly sheep (*pecore matte*, as the great poet calls them), blindly follow their blind guides in the interpretation of passages, without even taking the trouble to read the canonical text they pretend to gloze. But all this was known already. And why should it not happen among canonists, when it happens daily amongst moral theologians and other tractators of theology and its supplemental branches? Every petty professor (or at

least two out of three) of Canon Law, Moral Theology, Liturgy, etc., nowadays must give out his "Course," multiplying textbooks without necessity, having no claim to originality, no pretence of deep study or research. Now and then something of sterling value may appear, but how rarely! Any one acquainted with the current theological literature of Italy, France, and Germany in our day (for it is to these countries our observations are chiefly directed), say during the last fifty years, must be aware of this. They only cull from this and that quarter, not always tastefully; repeat in a slovenly way what had been better said before them, and if their guide has blundered, they innocently blunder in his footsteps.

Why, then, does Dr. Smith seek to terrify us by an array of names? Witnesses, in our case, are to be counted by weight not number—*ponderandi non numerandi*. Otherwise the Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore could be proved to be the work of the first centuries. One or two of them are great names. We are willing to give way before them, with all deference and humility, in any matter of speculative opinion. But in a plain matter of fact, we do not feel equally willing to be led by the nose. For the sake of argument we will grant, that the payment of voluntary offerings is compulsory, and that the faithful who break the law may be (ought to be, if you will, *cogendi*) prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts and compelled to pay. This, then, is the law; and the only question left is: Where is it written? Reiffenstuel and Laymann, and consequently the whole *servum pecus* of their modern copyists, all without exception, give the sixty-sixth canon of the Fourth Lateran Council. We can only conclude that they have not read it; if they have, they have read it so carelessly as to misunderstand and misinterpret its meaning. They would have us think that the canon was directed against recalcitrant laymen. It was directed, as its heading shows, against clerical greed. "De eadem (sc. simonia) circa cupiditatem clericorum." What is said of the laity, comes in as an afterthought, only *per incidens*. They think the canon contemplates close-handed parishioners, unwilling to pay their dues. On the contrary the portion of the canon in question was framed against laymen who were heretics, and who under the guise of a purer Christianity (they called themselves Cathari or Puritans), made war upon the Church and her clergy. They say such reluctant Catholic parishioners are to be dragged into the bishop's court for having refused payment, and condemned to pay the missing fees. Not a word of this in the canon. But these wicked laymen, not Catholics, but Patarini, imbued with the leaven of heresy and influenced by the same (*ex fermento hæreticæ pravitatis*), and who *on that account* (not refuse or neglect once or twice to pay their dues, but) exert themselves to break down the pious practice of voluntary oblations, are to be summoned by the bishop of the diocese, and brought before his court, not disciplinary but inquisitorial, for this is a matter of faith not of discipline. There is he to take cognizance of the truth of the allegation, and if he find them *guilty*, he is to restrain them, keep them within bounds, punish them. Guilty of what? Of non-payment of dues? So says M. Craisson ("Recusantes"), amongst others. But the Council knew and understood, and knew how to explain, its own mind better than canonists have since succeeded in doing, because they would not take the trouble to read the Decree. The Fathers of Lateran say "guilty of *malice* in striving to overthrow a laudable custom." It is not then a disobedience springing from avarice or penuriousness, but a contempt openly evinced for Church usages, and originating in *malice*, i. e., heretical hatred of the Church and her sacred ministry. Is there any



foundation in all this for the assertions of Craisson and Dr. Smith? We have conceded for the present that offerings are compulsory dues and that they may be collected by legal process in the bishop's court. But is it so written in the Council of Lateran, to which all of them refer, and on which solely they rely? This is a question of fact, which any student is as competent to examine as Laymann, Craisson, or Dr. Smith. The latter studiously avoids all discussion of the canon itself, content to pile up the names of those who understand the canon as he does. Our opinion may be singular, but if convinced we are ready to change it. That our readers may have a chance of judging for themselves, here is the Canon itself with translation :

"Ad Apostolicam audientiam frequenti relatione pervenit, quod quidam clerici pro exequiis mortuorum et benedictionibus nubentium et similibus pecuniam exigunt et extorquent ; et, si forte cupiditati eorum non fuerit satisfactum, impedimenta fictitia fraudulenter opponunt. E contra vero quidam laici laudabilem consuetudinem erga sanctam Ecclesiam, pia devotione fidelium introductam, EX FERMENTO HÆRETICÆ PRAVITATIS nituntur infringere sub prætextu canonicæ pietatis. Quapropter et pravas exactiones super his fieri prohibemus, et pias consuetudines præcipimus observari : statuentes ut libere conferantur ecclesiastica sacramenta, sed per Episcopum loci, veritate cognita, compeſcantur qui malitiose nituntur laudabilem consuetudinem immutare."—(Mansi's Collection of Councils, Venetiis, 1778, tom. xxii. col. 1054.)

"By frequent reports it has been brought to the knowledge of the Apostolic See, that some clergymen exact and extort money for funeral services, for the nuptial blessing, and for other things of the kind ; and unless their greed be satisfied (by the parties who apply) they fraudulently bring forward fictitious impediments. And on the other hand some laymen being imbued with the leaven of heresy, under pretext of pious observance of the canons, try to break down the laudable usage (of offerings) in regard to Holy Church, which has been introduced by the pious devotion of the faithful. Wherefore we forbid these wicked exactions and order that pious usages be maintained ; decreeing hereby that the Sacraments of the Church shall be imparted gratuitously, but that all those who maliciously endeavor to change the (above mentioned) laudable usage shall, after judicial inquiry, be kept within bounds by the bishop of the place."

In this whole matter at issue, we are aware of the disadvantage under which we labor. Dr. Smith finds himself on what in more than one sense may be called the popular side. He is not unconscious of the vantage-ground which he occupies, nor does he fail to use it for his purpose. And he, too, in turn, is used, for their own purposes, by his friends and backers, from the puny village paper to the grave and sober magazine. Let him rest content with his partisan advantage, and not eke it out further by invoking impartial names, great and honored, to bury us under the weight of the argument *ad verecundiam*. He omits no opportunity of informing the reader, that the authors whom he quotes and follows, and with whom we have presumed to disagree, are praised and commended by Popes and Prelates. Thus De Herdt's Praxis was highly extolled by Cardinal Bartolini. M. Craisson's book was examined by Roman censors, and bears in front a congratulatory epistle of Pius IX. to the author. Cardinal Soglia's work was honored by letters from two Pontiffs, Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. The inference from all this—the author does not venture to put it in words, but wishes it to creep silently into the reader's mind—may be stated as follows : "My reverence for Pius IX., of blessed memory, and for the Holy See, to which I

have unhesitatingly submitted all the teachings, theological, moral, and canonical, of my pamphlet, impels me to follow without doubt or question every opinion found in those authors whom Rome has consecrated by her august sanction. But how different, how unlike me, is that naughty Reviewer! He may not be, and I charitably hold he is not, a Turk exactly, or a Freethinker, but I must doubt his orthodoxy. He has no respect for the Craissons and others, whom the Pope has honored with his commendatory letters. In despising them, he despises and insults the Pope and his counsellors."

This is no play of imagination, but it is distinctly stated that the Reviewer has *insulted* Mgr. Roncetti and Professor Angelis by finding fault with Craisson's book, which they examined. These are not Dr. Smith's own words, but expressions of an anonymous "reverend friend," writing to Dr. Smith, who indorses the language by giving it a place in his pamphlet. By the way, the reverend author should not have been allowed to allege anonymous authority so freely in his pamphlet. We are treated to long extracts from great theologians, distinguished canonists, learned friends, all anonymous, not one of them having either name or *habitat*. Such testimony is worthless and must be ruled out of court. He ought to have remembered, and his friendly advisers or fellow-laborers ought to have reminded him, that a writer who cannot or will not quote fairly or honestly what is in print before the eyes of all, has debarred himself in logic and law alike from the right to appeal to written testimony, which no one but himself has seen or read.

To come back to our point, the reverend author of the pamphlet knows very well what is the just value of most letters of approbation, whether emanating from censors in Rome or in America, or from bishops or even the Pope. Had he sent a copy of his own "Elements," to the Holy Father, accompanied by a letter of filial devotion, he knows very well that Pius IX., that most kind-hearted and most amiable of men, would have sent him back a congratulatory letter, with which his publisher no doubt would have adorned the pages of the second edition. Had he obtained it, he knows very well that our opinion of the exact value of his "Elements" would not be altered in the least, and that neither he nor any of his friends would venture to make of the papal letter an *agis* for his "Elements." Why, then, should a congratulatory letter of Pius IX. be shaken threateningly in the face of critics and reviewers, to inspire them with due reverence for M. Craisson? Of the many bishops who gave—what shall we call them to avoid giving offence to the delicate ears of our fastidious canonist?—friendly letters to the author of the "Elements," we are convinced that not one of them ever conceived the idea, that the Reviewer was guilty of either insult or disrespect in their regard, for presuming to find fault with that book. Perhaps, some of them, for all we know, took it in very good part.

Before closing we wish to correct a mistake into which Dr. Smith has inadvertently fallen. We happened to say, that in some place he has given "by way of warning to bishops," the true, correct sense of the word "*elemosyna*." He thinks this was said *animo maligno*, with a view to poison the minds of the bishops against his book. Never did he shoot wider of the mark. We can assure him that we considered it, on the contrary, not only lawful but commendable for him to lay down the law for the instruction (which includes warning) of our bishops. They are bound by law, as well as priests, and not being either infallible or impeccable, they may mistake the extent, or fail in the discharge, of their obligations. It was commendable in him to do it, for we have

heard of some abuses in this very matter, not general but local, which deserve condemnation, and may yet receive it, at the hands of Rome.

To conclude, we have been able to give only a hurried and superficial review of this pamphlet, which was sent us at a late hour, when the REVIEW was preparing for the press. Though we have been compelled to write in haste, we hope this has not influenced our temper. We are glad to bring our remarks to an end, and hope never to have occasion to return to the subject.

---

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION; or, The Scriptural Cosmology, with the Ancient Idea of Time-worlds in Distinction from Worlds in Space. By *Taylor Lewis*, Professor in Union College. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1879.

The design of this work is to "set forth the Biblical idea of creation, philologically ascertained, or 'creation as revealed,' in distinction from any scientific or inductive theory of the earth." Dr. Lewis "thinks that he can truly claim that this is the first attempt to discuss the question at any length from the Scriptural or philological side." In making this assertion he does not wish "to seem unjust towards the pious and able men who have of late defended the twenty-four hour hypothesis," and explains that with them "the exegetical is far from being the predominant element." The learned author has adopted the general idea, suggested by St. Augustine, that the "days" spoken of in Genesis are periods marking successive processes or stages in the formation of the earth.

In developing and endeavoring to prove this, Dr. Lewis examines laboriously and minutely all the Scriptural texts which he thinks throw light upon the subject, and comparing and analyzing them, subjects them to a rigorous exegetical examination.

To those who are concerned about the attacks of infidels upon the Mosaic record, on the assumption of its discrepancy with scientific conclusions, so-called, the work will be highly interesting; but to those who are grounded in the faith that "the world was framed by the Word of God," it seems rather a waste of learning and ability.

As regards the main question which the work discusses, there are only three possible positions:

First, Catholics, certain of the absolute infallible truth of divine revelation as interpreted by the Church, observe without the slightest concern, as to ultimate consequences, the assumed irreconcilability of scientific discoveries with divine revelation. They know that truth is consistent with itself, and that when the last meaning of every real discovery in the natural world is reached and understood, it will be found not in contradiction to, but in perfect harmony with revelation. Hence when a fact, or supposed fact, is set up against the truths of Christianity, they at once conclude, on grounds of the highest reason, that either the alleged fact is *not* a fact, or else that its true place among other facts, its relations to them and its real meaning, have not yet come to be correctly understood.

Hence, on the one hand, the Church regards not only without apprehension but with pleasure, investigation and study in every sphere of human knowledge, and not only does not forbid nor discourage them, but fosters and promotes them, knowing that when their ripe fruits shall all have been gathered in, and their final results shall have been reached, they will furnish new illustrations and confirmations of her own doctrines.

Secondly, There are the rationalistic scientists, who assume the certainty of human science and deny or ignore divine revelation. They undertake to pursue a like process to that of Catholics, but in the reverse order. Catholics test the assumptions and supposed conclusions of science by the certain, unerring truths of revelation as taught infallibly by the Church; scientists, on the other hand, undertake to subject divine revelation to the test of the supposed truths of science. They attempt to overthrow the certainty of faith by the uncertainty of scientific assumptions and theories based on partial and incomplete investigations, whose final results and last meaning have not yet been reached.

"Evangelical Protestants" form the third class. They, confessedly, have no certain elements whatever to start from in their attempts to solve the questions raised by scientists. They profess, it is true, belief in an infallible Bible; but they are entirely at sea as to its interpretation. Thus, uncertain on the one hand as to the meaning of divine revelation, and, on the other, uncertain as to the real results of scientific investigation, they resemble persons who attempt to evolve a known quantity out of two that are unknown.

Even supposing that Dr Lewis's laborious and minute exegetical examination of Scripture texts were correct, we do not perceive that he has contributed anything towards the "reconciliation" which he deems so important. Supposing that he showed clearly that *his* interpretations of Scripture were in perfect harmony with the scientific theories of the day, he would have to do his whole work over again to-morrow. For scientific theories are continually changing. Opinions that were tenaciously held a few years ago, are given up to-day; and those of to-day are plainly in process of being superseded by others in the near future. When human science arrives at positive, absolute, unchangeable knowledge of the ultimate meaning of what it investigates and studies, it will be time enough to compare its results with the teaching of divine revelation. To attempt it sooner seems to us very much like chasing a will-o-the-wisp.

---

EDUCATION AS A SCIENCE. By *Alexander Bain, LL.D.* New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879. 12mo. pp. 453.

This book is the twenty-fifth of the International Scientific Series. It is in keeping with the others; and we consider it by far superior to Dr. Bain's other contribution on *Mind and Body*, which seemed to us very crude.

The author's view is different from that usually taken of education, inasmuch as he attempts to place it upon a scientific basis. But we do not regard his effort as altogether successful. In real science the whole subject and its method flow from a few well-understood principles. Now the basis of a science of education is psychology and moral philosophy. In these must its principles be grounded. But Dr. Bain, though in some manner or other dealing with these subjects, fails to lay down the principles they disclose. In their stead he is content to assert some surface observations in reference to the workings of human nature.

We are prepared for some strange disclosures on the subject of moral and religious training, when we remember that Dr. Bain is not of the Scotch school of Reid, but rather of a materialistic school that has many points of contact with the teachings of Mill, and Herbert Spencer, and Darwin. For example, the religious question he dismisses in this flippant manner: "People might well be satisfied, as far as regards the school, with

the markedly Theistic and Christian vein of all the lesson-books, and with the great susceptibility of the young mind to the explanation of the world by a personal God. Any results beyond should be sought somewhere else" (p. 424). We need scarcely add that the results of such a training would be anything but Christian. They are such as would suit Messrs. Herbert Spencer and John Fiske. They would be the destruction of all religion. Dr. Bain is beyond his depth in treating of this burning question. To be part of a man's thinking and the principle of his actions, religion must surround him from the cradle to the grave, everywhere guiding and instructing him, on all occasions, under all circumstances, his protector and good angel. It must be as intimate a part of his existence as his breathing. On the moral and religious bearing of education we cannot recommend *Education as a Science*. But there is a book which we would like to see in the hands of every thinker and educator. It is a work written by Dr. Stapf, of Germany, and translated into English and published in Edinburgh many years ago. It is called in its English dress *The Spirit and Scope of Education*. We suggest to our enterprising Catholic publishers its republication in this country. It is admirable on all those points on which the book under review is weakest. And it is as fully entitled to the claim of being a scientific treatise.

In the instructional part of his book Dr. Bain says many good things. But when he starts off on a crusade against the study of the Latin and Greek languages, he drops a great many essential quantities out of his reckoning. For the Catholic student the Latin language must always hold an almost sacred character. It is the language of the Church. It is the language in which she speaks to the faithful in all parts of the earth. It is the language in which is preserved the record of her glories and her triumphs, her struggles and persecutions, and the lives and words of her saints and her learned men. But it were almost sufficient reason for the study of Latin that in it is written the *Summa* of St. Thomas. Catholic colleges cannot dispense with the study of the classics and retain their claim to the title of Catholic. It may do well enough for the sophists of the hour who have no part to study, or to whom the past is a reproach, or who would have their disciples know no other horizon than that which their farthing candles reveal. The descendants of the Gregories and the Leos, of Augustine and Aquinas, must have a better training and a nobler education.

---

THE DAWN OF HISTORY: An Introduction to Prehistoric Study. Edited by C. F. Keary, M.A., of the British Museum. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

The study of prehistoric times is of comparatively recent date. But, brief as is the period since it has become a specialty, we can trace a like change in its progress and history to those which have occurred in astronomy and geology. It is within the personal recollection of many of the readers of the REVIEW, when both of these branches of physical science were popularly supposed to threaten the overthrow of the truths of divine revelation. Every spouter and smatterer who aspired to be regarded as *liberal* or *advanced* in his ideas, appealed to real or supposed astronomical or geological facts as containing indubitable proofs that the Scriptures could not be true. In like manner archæological investigations into the history and antiquities of Egypt were confidently appealed to as successfully impeaching the earlier Old Testament writings. A few

years passed, and when a careful sifting of the results attained in all three of these branches of science was made, and crude surmises gave place to more thoughtful reflection, the results were found confirmatory, in different and independent ways, of the statements of divine revelation. The study of prehistoric times is evidently passing through a similar process. A few years ago it was confidently predicted that it would disprove, beyond all question or doubt, the common origin of mankind. Already, however, it has been found that instead of leading to any such conclusion it furnishes many strong proofs of the unity of the human race. In like manner it was supposed that it would confirm the popular theory, among modern physicists, of evolution, and furnish incontestable evidence that the primitive man was a savage but little removed from an ape; yet already the more careful and thoughtful students of prehistoric times have come to feel, on scientific grounds, that such a conclusion would not only be premature, but irreconcilable with many ascertained archæological facts.

The work before us is an important contribution to the study of prehistoric times. It is made up of essays by two English scientists, H. M. Keary and C. F. Keary, M.A., of the British Museum. As a summary of facts and materials collected by various archæological investigators it is valuable. To criticize the opinions expressed or implied in its pages, strikes us as a waste of time. For, as is well remarked in the preface, "Prehistoric science has not yet passed out of that early stage when workers are too busy in the various branches of the subject to spare much time for a comparison of the results of their labors," when, one may say, "fresh contributions are pouring in too fast to be placed upon their proper shelves in the storehouse of our knowledge." Under such circumstances it is evident that for any scientist to undertake to dogmatize or make positive assertions on the basis of processes of investigation that are confessedly still progressing and far from complete, would be the height of folly.

Yet incomplete as these prehistoric studies are, they have progressed far enough to knock to pieces the crude, but self-confident theories, based on discoveries, real or supposed, respecting the stone age, that man started as a debased savage.

---

BISMARCK IN THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR, 1870-1871. Authorized translation from the German of *Dr. Moritz Busch*. Two volumes in one. Authorized Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This work is intended to be a life portrait of Bismarck during the memorable seven months of the Franco-German war. The author had rare facilities for studying the character of the person he undertakes to depict. He was an attaché of the Count's ministerial bureau, and his medium for inspiring the public press, particularly in Germany, and to some extent in England also. He was a member of the household of the Imperial Chancellor, or, as he was then called, the Chancellor of the Confederation, and was immediately attached to his person during the whole period of the war and the negotiations for peace at its close.

A pen portrait of Bismarck made by a person enjoying such facilities for becoming intimately acquainted with his habits, ideas, and private character, it might be supposed could scarcely fail to be in the highest degree interesting. Dr. Busch's work, however, fails to fulfil this reasonable expectation. He has endeavored, consciously or unconsciously, to fill to the Chancellor of Germany the part which Boswell

did to Johnson, but he lacks the sincerity and truthfulness of Boswell. He is a sycophant, but his very sycophancy is inspired rather by self-interest than by honest admiration. He was, according to his own account, nothing else than a hireling writer, whose chief work was to "inspire" German newspapers with the sentiments Bismarck suggested, and very often to deny and misrepresent well-known facts, and to state as facts what were known to be not facts. There is every reason to believe, too, that his journal of Bismarck's conversations "at dinner, at tea, and on other occasions," was revised by Bismarck himself. Consequently Dr. Busch's accounts are not records of what Bismarck actually said, but of what he wished to be reported as having said.

Yet perfect disguise is impossible. The most skilful concealment fails at one point or another to prevent glimpses, at least, of truth. And reading under or between the lines of this record of Bismarck's table talk, enough comes to view to show his vanity, his intense egotism, his utter want of moral principle, his cold-blooded selfishness, arbitrariness, and cruelty. He was intensely jealous of all others. Dissatisfaction and discontent seemed his chronic condition of mind. The suggestions of his fellow-councillors were regarded as officious intermeddling, and no one, from the King down, was correct or right in anything he said or did, except himself. He continually complained of the manner in which the war was conducted, of the slowness of the Generals, and of their want of severity. Though France was devastated wherever the German troops marched, Bismarck complained that they were too merciful. That every village was not burned, and that every French tireur who was taken prisoner was not at once shot, was to him a constant and sore grievance.

THE GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH GRAMMARS, with an Introduction, Historical and Critical; the whole methodically arranged and amply illustrated: To which are added four Appendices, pertaining separately to the four Parts of Grammar By *Goold Brown*, author of "The Institutes of English Grammar," "The First Lines of English Grammar," etc. Tenth Edition. Revised and improved. Enlarged by the Addition of a copious Index of Matters. By *Samuel E. Berrian, A.M.* New York: William Wood, 27 Great Jones Street. 1879.

This admirable work has been before the public so long and has obtained so firmly an established and high a position as a standard authority on the subject of English grammar, that to praise it seems superfluous. We confine our notice, therefore, to a few statements of the author taken from his preface, of his own design of the work. "It is not," he says, "a work of mere criticism, nor yet a work too tame, indecisive, and uncritical; . . . not a mere philosophical investigation of what is general or universal in grammar, nor yet a minute detail of what forms only a part of our own philology; . . . not a mere grammatical compend or compilation." The work is all of these, but it is more. It is intended to describe the best method of studying and teaching English grammar, to facilitate the study of the English language, to settle, so far as the most patient investigation and the fullest exhibition of proofs could do it, the multitudinous and vexatious disputes which have hitherto divided the sentiments of teachers, and made the study of English grammar so uninviting, unsatisfactory, and unprofitable, to the student whose taste demands a reasonable degree of certainty."

This edition of the work has been carefully revised or improved by an eminent master of English grammar. The typography and binding are of a style suitable to the valuable contents of the work.

HEALTH AND HOW TO PRESERVE IT. *Professor McSherry*, University of Maryland, Baltimore. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1879.

The reading of this work is about as good an example of the *utile dulci* as one can readily find, for the matter is most interesting, whilst the style is in the author's well-known pleasing manner of imparting information—in a conversational way. The work is simply scientific common sense, and must command a widespread study when known. There are few works of a medical character which do not bristle with technical terms, usually frightful to the uninitiated, whilst many such books treat of specialties certainly not intended for, nor suitable to the majority of the members of a family. This book, however, not only can be read by any one, but should be studied carefully by all who are interested (and who is not?) in the great subject on which it treats. It would certainly save ten times its cost every year were people to follow the sound advice therein contained. May we not indulge the hope that the distinguished Professor will continue to give us more and more of his extended experience and deep knowledge, since “preventives far exceed cures,” and these efforts are in the right direction, and will bring incalculable good to the community at large.

---

MOTIVES OF LIFE. By *David Swing*. Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co. 1877.

If there were any room for doubt that Protestantism was fast lapsing into sheer infidelity, it would be dispelled by glancing over this little work. Its author is a prominent and acknowledged representative of what is called *Liberal Christianity*, yet there is not one thought in the work that might not have been expressed by a heathen. The *name* of Christ is found in its pages, but you might substitute for it that of Confucius or Socrates, or Zoroaster or Brahma, without injury to the sentiments expressed, unless it be that such a substitution would necessitate a less feeble recognition of the existence of truth as an actual reality, and a stronger expression of the actual need of a divine revelation to man. The only idea that we can get from the whole, is that life, whether that of the individual or of the human race, is nothing more than a constant but confused movement, and that when this movement happens to be in the right direction, it is towards unattainable truth—a conclusion entirely consistent with sheer skepticism, but utterly irreconcilable with belief in divine revelation.

---

DIATIKI, ETC.: The New Testament, or the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah. A literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito version. By *James Murdock, D.D.* New York: Carter & Brothers, 1879.

The idea of the translation was a very good one. Dr. M. was charmed with the simplicity of the Peshito, and determined that others should share his pleasure and delight. Hence this translation. The Syriac version, no doubt, excels in clearness, and there is scarcely a passage in it that presents mere verbal difficulties. Whatever difficulty there may remain is not to be ascribed to the interpreter but to the obscurity of the meaning hidden under the revealed words. We intend to examine in our next some of the rules that Dr. Murdock has prescribed for himself in undertaking the translation, and how far he has complied with them. It will be seen that while at times very exact in his rendering, at others he is loose and not always faithful. Yet his undertaking is a step in the right direction, for the Peshito is a valuable aid to the exegesis, especially, of the New Testament.



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- MONTH OF MAY; or, A Series of Meditations on the Mysteries of the Life of the Blessed Virgin, and the Principal Truths of Salvation, for each day of the month of May. From the French of Father Debussi, S. J. Translated by *Miss Ella McMahon*, and revised by a Member of the Society of Jesus. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. An excellent and edifying manual of devotion. 1879.
- STATES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND VOCATION, according to the Doctors and Theologians of the Church. By *Rev. J. Berthier*, Missionary of Our Lady of La Salette. Preface by *Rev. Joseph Shea, S.J.* With the approbation of the Master of the Sacred Palace, and of his Eminence, Cardinal McCloskey. New York: P. O'Shea. 1879. 12mo., pp. 292.
- INTRODUCTIO IN SACRAM SCRIPTURAM ad usum Scholarum Pont. Seminarii Rom. et Collegii Urbani de *Prop. Fide*, auctore Ubaldo Ubaldi Presbytero Romano SS. Liter. Professore. Vol. Secundum: Introductio Critica, pars secunda et tertia. Romæ: ex Typographia Polyglotta S.C. de Propaganda Fide. 1878. Large 8vo., pp. 643.
- FIDEI ET MORUM FUNDAMENTA. Seu Instructio Brevis pro Omnibus, qui Salutem in Veritate Quærunt, nec Expeditam rei Tanti Momenti Investigandæ Opportunitatem Habent. Auctore J. Van Luytelaar, C.S.S.R. Neo-Eboraci, Cincinnati, S. Ludovici, Einsidlæ: Benziger Fratres, Summi Pontificis Typographi. 1878.
- LECTURES, ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION, as Illustrated by the Religions of India. Delivered in the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, in April, May, and June, 1878. By *F. Max Müller, M.A.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879. 8vo., pp. 382.
- THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE SECOND CENTURY; or, The Age of the Antonines. By *W. W. Capes, M.A.*, late Fellow of Queen's College, and Reader in Ancient History in the University of Oxford. With two Maps. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.
- EARLY ROME. From the Foundation of the City to its Destruction by the Gauls. By *W. Ihne, Ph.D.*, Professor at the University of Heidelberg, Author of "The History of Rome." With a Map. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- THE ENGLISH REFORMATION; How it came about, and why we should uphold it. By *Cunningham Geikie, D.D.*, Author of the "Life and Words of Christ." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879. 8vo., pp.
- DESTRUCTION AND RECONSTRUCTION. Personal Experiences of the Late War. By *Richard Taylor*, Lieutenant-General in the Confederate Army. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE MYSTERY OF THE CROWN OF THORNS. With Practical Devotions. By a *Passionist Father*, Author of "The Christian Trumpet," etc. D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1879.
- THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES. By *J. Harris Patton*, Author of the "Concise History of the American People." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE MULTITUDINOUS SEAS. With illustrations. By *S. G. W. Benjamin*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- THE FAIRY LAND OF SCIENCE. By *Arabella B. Buckley*, Author of "A Short History of Natural Science," etc. Illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co.
- OCEAN WONDERS. A Companion for the Seaside. Freely illustrated from living objects. By *William E. Damon*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.
- A LATIN GRAMMAR, founded on Comparative Grammar. By *J. H. Allen* and *J. B. Greenough*. Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1878.
- LATIN LESSONS, adapted to Allen & Greenough's Latin Grammar. Prepared by *R. F. Leighton, Ph.D.* Revised edition. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1878.
- HEALTH PRIMERS. By *Botts & Bothing*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

Vol. IV.—JULY, 1879.—No. 15.

---

## RELIGION AND CULTURE.

THE simple and comprehensive idea of education includes within itself almost everything. It is as many-sided as human nature, and its limits are as wide as the capacities of the soul, which in its hopes, desires, and aspirations is infinite. All things have an educational value, and that man is educable is the great and guiding fact in history. Forms of government, laws, social customs, literature, industrial arts, climate, and soil not only educate, but are esteemed according to the kind of education which they give. Whatever tends to make one more than he is or to hinder him from being less than he is, is a part of education. The various races of men are doubtless unlike in their natural endowments, but they differ far more widely by reason of the dissimilar educational influences which have acted upon them.

It may be affirmed with truth that our good qualities are acquired.

We are taught to be modest, truthful, brave, gentle, humane, as we are taught to speak a language. Excellence is thus a triumph over nature, and virtue is the result of victories over instinctive passion. The tendency so common in our day to exalt instinct, almost to consecrate it, springs from an optimistic theory which is utterly at variance with the facts. The wise man does not follow nature but subdues it into conformity with reason; though to do this he must, of course, work in accordance with the laws of nature. The first and deepest element in the life of the individual as of the race is religious faith, which consequently is the chief and highest instrument of education. Religion is man's supreme effort to rise above nature and above his natural self. It gives him a

definite aim and an absolute ideal. "Be ye perfect," it says, "as your Heavenly Father is perfect." It constitutes him a dweller in a world where mere utility has no place. It gives him high thoughts of himself, and thereby exalts his aims and heightens his standards of conduct. It makes him feel that to be true, to be good, to be beautiful, is most desirable, even though no practical gain or use should thence follow. It turns his thoughts to spiritual worth and diminishes his estimate of what is accidental and phenomenal. It addresses itself to the soul, and seeks to give it that pre-eminence which is the condition of all progress; for, "by the soul only shall the nations be great and free." It proclaims the paramount worth of right conduct, which alone brings a man at peace with himself, and thus makes possible the harmonious development of his being. Little cause for wonder is there that everywhere in all time priests should be the first teachers of the race; that poetry, and music, and painting, and sculpture, and architecture should first become possible when the creative voice of faith in the unseen commands them to exist. But upon this it is not my purpose now to dwell, and I merely intimate that true religion, as it appeals to all man's highest faculties with supreme power, must necessarily promote true culture. The direct aim of religion, however, is not to produce culture, nor is it the immediate aim of culture to produce religion; and it may, therefore, happen that they come in conflict. I take the matter seriously, and have not the faintest desire to join in the easy sneer with which this word, *culture*, is often received. That in the mouths of the frivolous and the vulgar it should be no better than cant, is only what may happen to any word which such persons take up, and it were wiser to reflect that the ideal of culture has exercised an irresistible fascination over many of the most finely endowed minds that have ever lived.

The word itself may not indeed be the best; but it seems to serve the purpose better than any other which we who speak English possess. They who propose culture to us as something desirable, would have us aim at a full and harmonious development of our nature, greater freedom from narrowness and prejudice, more disinterested and expansive sympathies, flexibility and openness of thought, courtesy and gentleness, and whatever else goes to form the idea of a liberal education. And if we ask them what end we may expect to gain by following this advice, we betray our inability to appreciate their words. Culture is an end in itself, and brings its own reward. It is good to have a trained and flexible mind, wide and refined sympathies. Just as those who are truly religious do not value their faith for any worldly advantage which it may give them, so the disciples of culture cannot consider the pursuit of excellence as a means of success. To aim at such a

result would be to deny the virtue of culture. They are little concerned with the usefulness of knowledge. The knowledge is more than its use, and they choose rather to be intelligent than to be rich or powerful or in office.

To urge the pursuit of learning with a view to money-making is apostasy from light, is desertion to the enemies of the soul. This opinion, it is needless to say, is in open conflict with our American notions of education. Utility is our guiding principle in this matter, and to say of any kind of knowledge that it is not useful is to condemn it. The best defence which we can set up in behalf of religion itself is to prove that it promotes the general welfare; that it is useful, not that it is true. Hardly any man with us is able to rise above this spirit, which controls not only our elementary, but equally our higher education. We universally regard knowledge as a means to worldly success. A certain mental training we hold to be essential, and those who go beyond this study with a view to entering some one of the professions. But to study for even a learned profession is not the way to get a liberal education; for this highest culture comes when the mind is disciplined for its own sake, and not with the view to narrow and fit it to any trade or business. Hence, it not unfrequently happens that successful professional men are almost wholly lacking in general intelligence, mental flexibility, and wide sympathies. And this is even used as an argument against culture.

That we take a utilitarian and low view of education is neither accidental nor unintentional. It is the view which our history suggests and seems to justify, and it is the one which we as a people have deliberately chosen to adopt. And in the estimation of a very great many persons the result is satisfactory. The aim is not exalted, and it has been attained with remarkable rapidity and ease. Hence we are self-complacent and inclined to boastfulness. We point with pride to our vast population, to the boundless extent of territory which we have subdued and forced to yield up its wealth, to the roads and cities which we have built, to the schools which are within the reach of all and are the same for all, to the industrial and commercial enterprise which enables us to compete successfully in the markets of the world with the oldest and richest nations, to the inventive genius which leads in the application of mechanical contrivances to the production of personal and social comfort, and to crown our happiness we are the freest of all peoples. That we are faultless no one pretends to claim; but our achievements are so real and valuable, that we should not be slow to believe that the methods which have enabled us to accomplish so much will give us also the power to overcome the dangers which may threaten our peace and progress. Our aims are mechanical,

and in congratulating ourselves upon the success with which we attain them we lose sight of the fact that these aims ought not to be pursued as ends in themselves. Freedom and wealth, like railroads and telegraphs, are means and not ends. Their value is not in themselves, but in what is made possible through them; and it is the office of culture to force people to recognize this. The cultivated mind is smitten with the love of an internal and spiritual beauty, and holds machinery cheap. It is bent upon seeing things as they are; it looks through marble walls and gaudy liveries and the smoke of factories, and will not be content until it discovers what beauty and truth, if any, are hidden under these shows. It is wholly free from the superstition of wealth and success. If the rich man is ignorant, coarse, and narrow, he is a beggar in the eyes of culture. Fond parents in this land find great comfort in the thought that their boy may one day be President of the United States; but if the President is a sot or a boor, culture will ignore him though he should hold office for life.

We cannot laugh at culture to any good purpose, for it has the spiritual mind which judges all things. To the opinions of the vulgar it gives no heed, and they who have insight are reverent, seeing that it is good. It can be indifferent even to fame. Here again we may remark that its unworldly temper and spiritual standard of perfection bring it into friendly relation with religion. Culture is concerned with the formation of the mind and the character, and values all things with reference to this end. It does not despise temporal and mechanical benefits, but seeks to turn them to the account of the soul. The man is more than his money, or his office, or his trade. Wealth is good in that it gives freedom and independence, the opportunity for self-improvement. The worth of all this money-getting industrialism which absorbs our life is in the preparation which it makes for culture. The test of civilization is the degree of human perfection which it produces. To dwell with complacency upon the thought of our cities, railroads, and wealth, is to be narrow and vulgar. We are not concerned with wood, and stone, and iron, but with man. What kind of man will this social mechanism shape? This is what we are interested to know, and this is what culture would have us keep in view. There are many intelligent, and otherwise not unfriendly persons, who placing themselves at this standpoint, find it impossible to look with enthusiasm or even complacency upon our American life. M. Renan, for instance, with whom the idea of culture is supreme, takes no pains to conceal his opinion of us. "The countries," he says, "which, like the United States, have created a considerable popular instruction, without any serious higher education, will long have to expiate this fault by their intellectual mediocrity,

their vulgarity of manners, their superficial spirit, their lack of general intelligence."

Again: "The ideal of American society is further removed than that of any other from the ideal of a society governed by science. The principle that society exists only for the welfare and freedom of the individuals of which it is composed, would seem to be contrary to the plans of nature, who takes care of the species, but sacrifices the individual. It is greatly to be feared lest the final outcome of this kind of democracy be a social state in which the degenerate masses will have no other desire than to indulge in the ignoble pleasures of the lower and vulgar man." And M. Renan thinks it probable that the senseless vanity of a population which has received elementary instruction, will make it unwilling to contribute to the maintenance of an education superior to its own; and he, therefore, has little hope that democracy will prove favorable to culture and the production of great men, which, in his opinion, is the end for which the human race exists. With this view of American life Mr. Matthew Arnold coincides. The circumstances of the case force him to think that America, the chosen home of newspapers and politics, is without general intelligence; "and that in the things of the mind, and in culture and totality, America, instead of surpassing us all, falls short." The cause of this he finds not so much in our democratic form of government as in the inherited tendencies of the people of the United States, which issues from the English Puritan middle class and reproduces its narrow conception of man's spiritual range.

The Puritan character with all its good points is undoubtedly angular, partial, and without æsthetic sympathy or appreciation, and the predominant influence of New England more than democracy has stood in the way of the harmonious development of American life. What literature we have is almost exclusively of Puritan origin; and when it smells of the soil it is narrow and provincial, and when it is the echo of European schools of thought it is tame and feeble. Theodore Parker, for instance, who is looked upon as one of the most liberal and cultivated minds of New England, is hard and fanatical, and almost wholly lacking in the sweetness and light which are essential elements of culture. His skeptical and rationalistic temper leaves him as deficient in totality as though he were one of the original Pilgrim Fathers. And in Mr. Emerson, who is generally supposed to come nearer the ideal of culture than any other American, there is a whimsicalness, a lack of sanity, and a mannerism, both of thought and expression, which are wholly at variance with completeness of character. We must not, however, be unfair to New England, which has been and still is the home of American culture, and though it be not the highest

it is the best we have. The South has never shown any love of intellectual excellence for its own sake. Its great men are politicians, partisan leaders; and some of the most famous, as Henry Clay, for instance, without liberal education. The West, in the public opinion, is only another name for coarseness and vulgarity; and it was hardly to be expected that a generation which had to fell the forest and drain the prairie should find leisure or opportunity for higher culture. Let us then receive with equanimity and good nature the criticism which finds us so greatly deficient in knowledge and refinement. Our ability to do this is of itself encouraging. The era in which it was possible to think that whatever is American is excellent has fortunately passed, and a greater familiarity with the history, the literature, and the manners of other nations has taken the freshness from our self-conceit. The sweet uses of adversity too have taught us most admirable lessons. Every man may have a vote, and every child may go to school, and the time may still be out of joint; the increase of national wealth need not protect the multitude from poverty and suffering, and the growth of intelligence may coexist with the decay of morals and the loss of faith.

"It is not fatal to Americans," says Mr. Arnold, "to have no religious establishments, and no effective centres of high culture; but it is fatal to them to be told by their flatterers, and to believe, that they are the most intelligent people in the world, when of intelligence in the true and fruitful sense of the word, they even singularly, as we have seen, come short."

Admitting all, even the worst that can be said of us on this point, our very enemies must nevertheless concede that the preparations for a higher culture have been made by us and exist under altogether favorable conditions. Great fault may be justly found with our whole educational mechanism. The colleges and universities are doubtless imperfect enough and often obstacles to the development of intelligence. But the remedy is in our hands.

Our wealth and industrialism place within easy reach whatever can be accomplished by money, and there are no difficulties which may not be overcome by earnest faith in the ideal which culture presents. The important question for us is whether this ideal ought to excite our admiration and love. A very great number of sincere and enlightened men, representing conflicting tendencies and opposite schools of thought, look upon the ideal of culture as false and hurtful to the best interests of man; and the objections which they urge are numerous and weighty. The masses of mankind, they say, have neither the opportunity nor the desire for culture; and this is fortunate, for devotion to this ideal has an unmistakable tendency to diminish zeal for the general welfare. The

men of culture hold themselves aloof from the crowd and take no interest in the practical questions of the day. They live in a dreamland of poesy, and in the consciousness of their inability to help forward any good cause content themselves with criticism which unsettles convictions and weakens the zest for action. They preach loud enough that the end of life is an act and not a thought, and yet both their example and their teaching tend to obscure all the ways of life in which men are accustomed to labor. Goethe writes poetry and preserves his philosophic serenity in the midst of the appalling calamities of his country, of which he seems to be altogether oblivious. Mr. Carlyle, through half a century, chides his fellow-men, accepts neither faith nor science, neither acts himself nor points out to others how they may labor to good purpose. Mr. Arnold frankly admits that he has no desire to see men of culture intrusted with power, and were he consulted by his countrymen on questions of actual moment he could only repeat the precept of Socrates, "Know thyself." When France lay crushed and bleeding at the feet of Germany, M. Renan withdrew to a quiet retreat to compose Platonic dialogues, in which he gives expression to his contempt for the crowd and his distrust of all the popular movements of the age. Culture thus seems to produce a skeptical and fickle habit of mind which is incompatible with strong and abiding convictions, and consequently destructive of resolution and enthusiasm, without which man cannot accomplish any great purpose in life; and Mr. Frederic Harrison may not be wholly mistaken in thinking that the men of culture are the only class of responsible beings in the community who cannot with safety be intrusted with power. This he says of England, and without reference to America, where this class can hardly be said to exist at all; and the apprehension of their getting into power need not, therefore, be a cause of anxiety to our statesmen, whose mental resources, even as things are, seem to be not more than sufficient to meet the demands which are made upon them. The believers in culture, it is further urged, are propagandists of a cosmopolitan and non-national spirit, which undermines patriotism, directs attention to an impossible ideal, and disenchants men of their inherited character, which, whatever may be its faults, is the essential basis of virtue and excellence. The education derived from the national genius, like that of the family, cannot be supplied by any other agency, and the cosmopolitanism which ignores this must necessarily tend to create a temper like that of the ideal Epicurean, who is described as indifferent to public affairs and the fate of empires, and not subject to any such weakness as pity for the poor or jealousy of the rich. In this view then culture is destructive of patriotism.

Other objections are urged against its ethical character. Cul-



ture, it is said, is only a refined epicureanism. Its aim is to educate man so as to fit him for the enjoyment of the greatest possible pleasure. It shrinks from vice, not because it is evil, but because it is gross and disgusting. The men of culture, like the ancient Greeks, are without the sense of sin, and consequently at best have but a conventional morality.

Aristophanes was not more pagan than Goethe, who is the typical representative of the new religion. He it is who taught that to be beautiful is higher than to be good; and his denial of sin is implied in the doctrine that repentance is wrong. He assumes that there is no objective standard of right and wrong. Man is a law unto himself, and the pursuit of perfection is the effort to bring all his faculties into free and unhindered play. That which I feel to be true is true for me; that which I feel to be good is good for me; and therefore creeds and dogmas, whether religious or philosophic, cease to have either life or meaning as soon as the time-spirit has flown from them. The web of life is woven of necessity and chance; we must yield to destiny and seek to make the most of chance. Happiness is to be sought not in the fulfilment of duty, but in the sweetness and light, which are the results of the complete and harmonious development of our nature. "Woe be to every kind of education," says Goethe, "which destroys the means of obtaining true culture, and points our attention to the end instead of securing our happiness on the way." The philosophy of culture is then, it would appear, only another form of utilitarianism, and tacitly assumes that greatest happiness-principle, against which it so loudly protests.

It, in fact, looks upon this life as alone real and enjoyable, and considers him a madman, who troubles himself here in the hope of attaining blessedness hereafter. Morality consequently is nothing absolute, and whatever secures our "happiness on the way" is good. The point sought to be made is this: that, as culture results intellectually in universal criticism and doubt, so it morally ends in unlimited indulgence. The vulgar herd, finding no delight in the refined and studied pleasures of the cultivated, will have no other way of showing its appreciation of their theories than by wallowing in Epicurus's sty. And this, indeed, is the history of culture amongst all peoples. We know from Aristophanes what was the moral condition of the age of Pericles; and he ascribes the frightful degeneracy from the standard of conduct which made the men who fought and won at Marathon, to what he most aptly calls the "new education," or in the language of our time, modern culture. The same story is repeated in Rome. Virtue and public spirit flourished in the midst of poverty and rustic manners; but when conquered Greece with the silken

chords of culture led her captors captive, together with letters and refinement every kind of corruption was introduced into the state; and the Latin classics almost universally attribute the ruin of their country to this cause. Sallust considers a taste for painting as a vice no less than drunkenness; and Horace abounds in praise of the rigid virtue and simple ways of the fathers. And in modern times the age of Leo X. was an era of moral degeneracy, and that of Louis XIV. was immediately followed by the most humiliating and disgraceful epoch in French history; while in England, culture, as represented by the court of Charles II. fostered the most loathsome and hideous sensuality. Germany's culture period, too, is one of moral paralysis, and it is not surprising that it should have created the philosophy of hate and despair as taught by Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann. Goethe himself may inspire admiration and enthusiasm, but not respect.

It is further urged that this historical relationship between culture and licentiousness is founded in the nature of things; that polite literature and the elegant arts necessarily tend to create frivolous and effeminate habits of thought and feeling, because they separate the sentiment from the deed, whereas the end of feeling is to impel us to act. To luxuriate therefore in fine sentiments, noble thoughts, and the elegancies of style, and to rest in this indulgence is of itself immoral. The springs of action are thereby perverted from their proper use, and a character is developed like that of novel readers who weep over the misfortunes of imaginary heroes, and spurn the wretched from their door. The lovers of culture themselves recognize the evil and the danger, and hence they vociferously preach the necessity of action; but in vain, as their own example shows. They give us fine theories, but have no hope of realizing them; which is not surprising, for the habit of considering things from every point of view, and of weighing all that can be said for and against every opinion, begets a sophistical and hesitating disposition, which as a matter of course renders action distasteful, and moreover warps the practical judgment and unfits it for deciding upon any right course of conduct. A dreamer is not a man of action, and the work of the world is not done by critics.

St. Paul's examples of men who wrought great things by faith may be generalized and applied universally. All heroic conduct springs from the confidence which comes of faith. Knowledge does not suffice; for what will be the outcome of a given series of human acts cannot be known, and must therefore be taken on trust. Men who perform grandly see what ought to be done and move forward; that is, they trust their intuitions, and not the analysis of a critical survey of the situation. At the battle of

Lodi, Napoleon said the bridge must be taken; his officers declared it impregnable; he unsheathed his sword and passed over it behind the fleeing enemy. Culture is diletantism. It may fill up an idle hour, but is as impotent to lead the world as millinery. In fact Mr. Arnold himself seems to perceive that it is just here that the special weakness of the new philosophy is revealed. The men of culture have failed conspicuously in conduct. They are unable even to subdue "the great faults of our animality." "They have failed in morality, and morality is indispensable." He insists again and again upon the paramount importance of conduct, and for the development of this ethical character he trusts to religion and not to culture. Hence though for him God is only "the stream of tendency," he will not give up the Bible. He throws aside indeed the whole dogmatic basis upon which the Bible rests, and yet would still seem to think that it is possible to preserve its moral teaching; and this leads us to another objection which is urged by the opponents of culture, viz., that it is irreligious. That this objection is not unfounded appears plainly to follow from what has already been said; for if culture fatally ends in universal criticism and immorality it is obviously in open conflict with religion. There is, it is true, an apparent similarity in their aims and ideals. Both propose perfection as the end to be sought for, and both place this perfection in an inward spiritual state, and not in any outward condition; and neither therefore looks upon material progress with the complacency which is so natural to the mere worldling. A deeper view however will discover the latent antagonism. The perfection at which culture aims is purely natural and has reference to this life alone. It loves excellence rather than virtue and is enamoured of beauty rather than of goodness. Religion emphasizes the evil of sin; culture its grossness. The thoughts of the religious are with God, while the lovers of culture are occupied with themselves, and hence humility is the attitude of the one and pride of the other. Self-denial is accepted by culture only as a means to higher and purer pleasure; by religion it is inculcated as the proof of love. Culture believes in this life only; religion in the life to come. And finally culture looks upon itself as an end; but in the eyes of religion it can be at best merely a means.

As it is not my purpose to enter a plea on behalf of culture I shall be at no pains to attempt an answer in detail to all these objections. That many of them at least are not captious, but are based upon real views of the subject I am ready to admit; and nevertheless the case of those who dispute the validity of the inference which is drawn, is, as I take it, not desperate. To those who urge that culture is cosmopolitan and weakens the spirit of patriotism, the reply may be made that an exaggerated nationalism

has been the cause of numberless woes to the human race. This is the stronghold of war and of all the train of evils which follow in its wake; this is the source of that restrictive legislation which has interfered with free trade and built barriers in the way of progress; this is the foment of that fatal prejudice which has nurtured a narrow conceit that shuts the rational mind of each country against the world's experience. Nor must it be forgotten that in this respect the influence of culture is in harmony with that of the Catholic Church, which is cosmopolitan and non-national.

The Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of all men, and of one world-wide spiritual kingdom in which all may receive the rights of citizenship, would seem to point towards a social state in which differences of race and country, if not obliterated, will at least remain comparatively inoperative. Again, the great battles of the Church with heresy have nearly all been waged against those who were striving to compress a Catholic religion into a national mould. That the men of culture would make but sorry statesmen or leaders of party we may grant. But a poet is not found fault with because he is not a metaphysician, nor is a general criticized for lack of taste in the fine arts. It is quite as important surely that there should be calm and enlightened thinkers as that there should be sturdy and indefatigable workers; and precisely where men are busiest with their temporal projects and mechanical contrivances, it is well that there should be found those who assume a loftier tone and point to higher aims. Every supreme mind, like the loftiest mountain peaks, rises into a region, where it dwells, far above the storm-cloud, in serene solitude; and, therefore, is it said that genius is melancholy. The most perfect culture also partakes of this loneliness, and is ill at ease in the crowd; but this only serves to enhance the value of the criticism which it pronounces upon the common ways and aims of men. He who, free from the passion and blinding dust of the conflict, surveys the field from an eminence, sees many things which are hidden from the eyes of the combatants. It is the fault of the eager rivalry of busy life that it leaves no time for calm reflection, and hence active workers grow narrow and would bend the universe to their little schemes. The salvation of society is made to depend upon the crotchet of a politician or upon the opening up of a new market for some article of commerce, or it is held to be within the competency of a school system to bring on the millennium. It is certainly of the first importance that men be fed, and clothed, and governed; but, as Goethe says, "the useful encourages itself, for the crowd produce it and none can dispense with it; the beautiful needs encouragement, for few can create it, and it is required by many." If the men of culture do not act they at least furnish the means of activity to others.

The old alchemists were no better than dreamers and idlers, but to them we are indebted for our physical science. It is easier to act than to think; and hence the world abounds in busy men, whereas a real thinker is hardly to be met with. Should we then employ all our efforts to stimulate an activity which is already feverish, and do nothing to encourage wider and profounder habits of thought? To take the lowest view, it will hardly be denied that the power to think correctly is useful. Idealists are often laughed at in their own day; but the dreams of the present not unfrequently become the recognized principles of action of the future. The common man, of course, living in the present, is impatient to see his labors bear immediate fruit; and a vulgar generation attaches little value to the good which can be enjoyed only by those who come after it; but without self-denial neither wisdom nor virtue can exist, and to aim at the reward which comes of right conduct is the certain way to disappointment. The charge that culture has an immoral tendency is more serious, and possibly not so easily set aside, for history seems to bear out the assertion that ages of luxury and refinement have been invariably remarkable for licentiousness of manners. It is plain, however, that the vices as well as the virtues of a civilized people differ from those of barbarians. The highway robber is generally no sybarite. Civilization brings large bodies of men together in cities, encourages industry, protects wealth, creates classes that abound in opulence and leisure, and it consequently offers opportunities for the indulgence of effeminate and luxurious habits. The spirit of an age of refinement is humane and merciful. Its tastes are nice and its pleasures attractive. The tempers of men are softened, and war itself smooths its rugged front, and is waged without vindictive cruelty. The weak are protected, the orphan is cared for, and the poor find sympathy. The man of culture sins by over-refinement, the vulgar man by excess in indulgence. Savages and barbarians are not epicures, but they are the slaves of gluttony and drunkenness to a greater extent than the civilized races. Again, venality and bribery will not be common in an age in which the ambitious and covetous find it easier to attain their ends by violence. It must be borne in mind too that the literature of an age of culture generally becomes classic, and hence the vices of those ages are made immortal while the memory of the crimes of barbarians perishes. And there is ever a spirit of restlessness and discontent in an epoch of refinement, which causes men to yield more readily to the natural propensity to depreciate the present and unduly exalt the past; and it so happens that its vices are precisely those which lend themselves most effectively to the purpose of the satirist. The misleading power of literature in this respect is painfully evident to Catho-

lics, who have so often been its victims. A few examples of cruelty and licentiousness are fastened upon, and are so perverted as to be made to appear to be the law to which they are only exceptions.

To consider the subject then apart from the question as to the relation which exists between religious faith and morality, and this is the view we now take of it, it does not appear that a state of culture is more favorable to vice than barbarism. It would seem on the contrary that knowledge, refinement, and industry tend to make men virtuous. If we hear less of the crimes of savage and barbarous peoples it is not because they do not abound, but because they are not recorded, or when recorded repel us, since a cultivated mind can find no pleasure in reading of rapine, and murder, and brutish orgies; whereas, unfortunately, such is the weakness of man, when sin loses its grossness, it seems even to those who are not depraved to lose something of its evil. Why a Catholic should be anxious to extenuate the faults of barbarians is not evident, for it has ever been the aim of the enemies of the Church to make her responsible for the crimes of the barbarous populations which she was leading to purer modes of life and higher thoughts.

But after all has been said, it must be confessed that the history of culture does not justify us in thinking that it is able to create a pure and genuine morality. At best it but throws the cloak of decency over the ulcer which it is powerless to heal. Ascetic writers tell us that in order to successfully combat sin we must have a real abhorrence of it, and this culture lacks. With it virtue is a point of good taste and vice want of breeding; and it does not hate the evil, but fears the shame and confusion of detection. This, I say, is the ethical character of historical culture, and I now proceed to examine whether it is a defect inherent in the nature of culture, or an accident attributable to the conditions under which it has been developed.

Culture, in the modern sense of the word, and considered apart from the influence of Christianity, is derived from Athens, the city of mind and the world's first university. No people has ever equalled the Athenian in mental versatility, grace, penetration, and originality. Goethe's proverb—"That to think is difficult, to act easy"—seems to be untrue in their case. Thought was as natural and as easy to them as to breathe, and there is hardly an intellectual or poetical conception in modern literature which may not be found in germ at least even in the comparatively small portion of their writings that have come down to us; and their language is still the most perfect instrument of thought known to men. They were, and to a great extent still are, the teachers of Europe in philosophy, eloquence, poetry, and art, and they have, therefore, necessarily exerted whether for good or evil a vast ethical influence. Now

to the Greek virtue and beauty are identical. His religion is the worship of the beautiful; and the good are the fair, the harmonious, the musical. The very name which he gave to the universe indicated that it revealed itself to his mind primarily under the aspect of harmony and proportion; and hence for conscience he substituted taste, a kind of exquisite sense of the graceful and the decorous, and his religion embodied itself in art. His sacred books were poems, his temples, which were models of grace and symmetry, were opened to the heavens and bathed in the cheerful light of day, and when he offered sacrifice and prayer he was crowned with flowers and quaffed the golden wine with song and dance. In his maturity he is only a handsome youth in whose veins the current of life is full and strong. He walks in a perennial spring, and the flowers bloom wherever he goes, and the air trills with the matin songs of birds. He lives in a world of delights and dreads nothing but death. He has no thought of sin, the very gods love what he loves and think no wrong. And when he praises virtue it is because it is noble, and beautiful, and full of pleasant sweetness. It is a fine figure, graceful and fair as a statue of Pentelic marble chiselled by the hand of Phidias. Unfortunately a theory based upon the assumption that to do right is to do only what is pleasant, will not fit into a world which has been wrenched from its original harmony. The sense of the beautiful was soon sunk in sensuous voluptuousness, and Athens has left us nothing to admire except her genius. And yet the ideal of life which her great minds have traced out for us is so noble, so generous, that we are hardly surprised that its winning grace and brightness should create a kind of worship in the sensitive souls of poets and artists, and thus impress ineffaceably its own fair features upon the culture of all succeeding ages. But as this ideal is without moral force and the seriousness of character which is thence derived, it is, like many fairest things, frail and unsuited to the stern work of a world where self-conquest is the price of victory. There is want of correspondence between the inward strength and the outward form, and in thinking of this noble dream of genius we can but repeat the poet's lament for Italy:

"Italia! oh Italia, thou who hast  
The fatal gift of beauty, which became  
A funeral dower of present woes and past,  
On thy sweet brow is sorrow ploughed by shame."

Culture is akin to poetry, but life is mostly prose and must rest upon a more substantial basis. Is it not possible, then, we ask, to bring to the help of this fine and artistic ideal of human perfection some force, not its own, from which it may derive the strength not

to yield to the fatality of its natural bent? In other words, can religion, whose dominant idea is morality, be brought into friendly relationship with culture, the ruling thought of which is beauty, or to use the accepted phrase, sweetness and light? In introducing the present examination I stated that there need be no antagonism between true religion and true culture, and I now find that I am called upon to defend or else to withdraw this affirmation. Deny thyself, is the word of Christ: Think of living, is the precept of culture; and certainly the self-indulgent and pleasure-seeking life of the Greek is the very opposite of the ideal which is presented to the Christian. The one looks upon this earth as a garden of delight; the other has no abiding city here, but passes as a pilgrim, who in the midst of gay scenes is restless, for his thoughts are with those he loves in the far-off home. The Greek rests in nature and worships it; the Christian looks through nature to God, and places it beneath his feet. To the one the cross is foolishness; to the other it is the power and wisdom of God. That culture is not Christianity needs no proof. Its whole history is characterized by the absence of that moral earnestness which is the very soul of religious faith, and it therefore lacks an element which is the chief constituent of human perfection. If culture is not Christianity, is Christianity culture; or is it also partial and without the power to create a full-developed humanity? This is the charge that Mr. Arnold, while frankly confessing the shortcomings of culture, brings against religion, which, he thinks, takes a narrow view of man, and is destined finally to be transformed and governed by the Hellenic idea of beauty and of a human nature perfect on all its sides. His criticisms on this subject, which are aimed chiefly at the Protestant theory of Christianity, are sprightly and entertaining. The Pilgrim Fathers, he says, and their standard of perfection are rightly judged "when we figure to ourselves Shakespeare or Virgil—*souls* in whom sweetness and light and all that in human nature is most humane, were eminent—accompanying them on their voyage, and think what intolerable company Shakespeare and Virgil would have found them." The ideal of the Dissidence of Dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion is, he says, "a life of jealousy of the Establishment, disputes, tea-meetings, openings of chapels, sermons;" which is doubtless dreary enough, and the very contrary of what one would naturally look for in a religion of love, whose divine Founder came to bring peace to men. Mr. Arnold probably never heard of "donation parties," in which a whole congregation descend upon a helpless minister with bean sacks, tin pans, and slippers, in the full belief that they are creating in him an inward sense of sweetness and light; nor of "sociables," which receive their name from defect of the quality implied; nor of "temperance



anniversaries," when model wives invite their friends and neighbors to tea and lemonade, that they may again recount the unspeakable woes that come of having husbands who have not taken the pledge, though he may possibly have something of this in his mind when he declares that Americans are Philistines, but a livelier sort of Philistine than the British.

"And the work," he says, "which we collective children of God do, our grand centre of life, our *city*, which we have builded for us to dwell in, is London! London, with its unutterable external hideousness, and with its internal canker of *publice egestas, privatim opulentia*—to use the words which Sallust puts into Cato's mouth about Rome,—unequalled in the world! The word, again, which we children of God speak, the voice which most hits our collective thought, the newspaper with the largest circulation in England, nay, with the largest circulation in the whole world, is the *Daily Telegraph!*" which is the English New York *Herald* or Chicago *Times*. Real Protestantism, Mr. Arnold thinks, is not merely lacking in sweetness and light, but is positively hideous and grotesque; and he very justly remarks that there are things in which defect of beauty is defect of truth. "Behavior," he says, "is not intelligible, does not account for itself to the mind and show the reason for its existing, unless it is beautiful. The same with discourse, the same with song, the same with worship, all of them modes in which man proves his activity and expresses himself. To think that when one produces in these what is mean or vulgar or hideous, one can be permitted to plead that one has that within which passes show; to suppose that what benefits and satisfies one part of our nature can make allowable either discourse like Mr. Murphy's, or poetry like the hymns we all hear, or places of worship like the chapels we all see,—this it is abhorrent to the nature of Hellenism to concede." Again: "Instead of our 'one thing needful' justifying in us vulgarity, hideousness, ignorance, violence,—our vulgarity, hideousness, ignorance, violence are really so many touchstones which try our one thing needful, and which prove that in the state, at any rate, in which we ourselves have it, it is not all we want."

That all this is not applicable to the Catholic Church is plain, and is implied in the traditional objections which Protestants make to our worship, and may also be inferred from the graceful tribute which Mr. Arnold pays to a man in whom the humblest and most trusting faith is united in sweet accord with the most perfect culture of this age. "And who," he asks, "will estimate how much the currents of feeling created by Dr. Newman's movements, the keen desire for beauty and sweetness which it nourished, the deep aversion it manifested to the hardness and vulgarity of middle-class

liberalism, the strong light it turned on the hideous and grotesque illusions of middle-class Protestantism, who will estimate how much all these contributed to swell the tide of secret dissatisfaction which has mined the ground under the self-confident liberalism of the last thirty years, and has prepared the way for its sudden collapse and supersession?" "Catholic worship," says Mr. Arnold, "is likely, however modified, to survive as the general worship of Christians, because it is the worship which, in a sphere where poetry is permissible and natural, unites the most of the elements of poetry." This, however, is only the æsthetic side of culture, and when the clever and sprightly critic whom I have been quoting views the subject from an intellectual standpoint, he takes up an altogether different position towards the Church, though he does not fall in with the vulgar prejudice which assumes that Protestantism has an intellectual superiority over Catholicism. On the contrary he finds such pretensions quite illusory. "For Hellenism," he says, "for the thinking side in man as distinguished from the acting side, the attitude of mind of Protestantism towards the Bible in no respect differs from the attitude of mind of Catholicism towards the Church." And again: "A free play of individual thought is at least as much impeded by membership of a small congregation as by membership of a great Church. Thinking by batches of fifties is to the full as fatal to free thought as thinking by batches of thousands." That men who accept the Old and the New Testament as literally God's word, should take on airs and look with pity upon the ignorance and credulity of Catholics who hold such articles of faith as the communion of saints and the absolving power of the priesthood, is a palmary example of the ridiculous absurdities into which the victims of a shallow conceit are betrayed. In Mr. Arnold's opinion then between æsthetic culture and the Church there is no antagonism, while moral culture can be attained only through religion; and towards intellectual culture Catholicism and Protestantism stand in a like unfriendly attitude. The advantage is on the side of the Church, and if there is any hope of an alliance between culture and religion, we must, it would seem, look to her to bring it about. If the thought of such an alliance is not to be entertained, then the more fairminded among the lovers of culture will themselves confess that it should perish rather than religion, which alone gives to the human heart hope and the promise of a future. The critical school holds that the solution of the difficulty is to be found in the abandonment of dogmatic faith, and the objection to the Church which it urges is not that it teaches this or that article of belief, but that it insists upon the necessity of believing in any doctrine whatever; and this is Mr. Arnold's meaning when he declares that we can neither do without Christianity

nor with it as it is. We cannot do without it, for upon it rests conduct, which is three-fourths of human life, and it is moreover a something incomparably beneficent; "the greatest and happiest stroke ever yet made for human perfection." To lose Christianity would be to lose all hope: it is indispensable; but the old grounds upon which men were accustomed to rest their belief in it are, so this critic at least, thinks, no longer solid, but have been undermined by the time-spirit. The Christian religion, to be plain, postulates the existence of a personal God, and Mr. Arnold holds that this is a pure assumption which cannot possibly be verified; and Celsus, he thinks, was therefore right when he charged the Christians with want of intellectual seriousness. He recognizes nothing but a "stream of tendency," a something not ourselves, which, as he believes, makes for what he imagines to be righteousness, and he seriously proposes to save the Bible and Christianity by floating them on this "stream of tendency;" and in the midst of such solemn trifling he takes occasion to read Christians a lesson on their lack of intellectual seriousness. To maintain that all we know of God is that there is a power or law or modality, not ourselves, and that what we call right conduct is in accordance with this law, is only a way of saying that God is unknowable; and Mr. Arnold himself has pointed out the absurdity of attempting to found a religion upon such a conception. "No man," he says, "could ever have cared anything about God in so far as he is simply unknowable. 'The unknowable is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble,' is what would occur to no man to think or say." Not less preposterous is it to imagine that men, who doubt the existence of a personal God, will still be able to read the Bible with reverence or profit.

Mr. Arnold's culturism is not original any more than Mr. Carlyle's mysticism. The one and the other are only English interpretations of German and French thought, and Mr. Arnold himself would be the first to acknowledge this; nay, he has confessed as much in the following words: "Now, as far as real thought is concerned, thought which affects the best reason and spirit of man, the scientific or the imaginative thought of the world, the only thought which deserves speaking of in this solemn way, America has up to the present time been hardly more than a province of England, and even now would not herself claim to be more than abreast of England; and of this only real human thought English thought itself is not just now, as we must all admit, the most significant factor." To get a satisfactory view of his position we must, therefore, pass over to the continent of Europe, with the understanding, however, that no attempt be made to reduce his views to a system. Lacordaire declared that, by the grace of God, he abhorred the

commonplace; and Mr. Arnold, probably without such grace, abhors all systems, whether mechanical, political, metaphysical, or theological. His chapters on "the God of Metaphysics," in which by a few simple etymologies and with perfect *gaieté de cœur* he dissipates into thin air the profoundest thought of the greatest minds who have ever lived, will doubtless be immortal as a curiosity of literature. He has no system, but he has a method, which is that of the modern critical school, which assumes as fundamental the celebrated maxim of Protagoras, "That man is the measure of all things." The eternal, the all-perfect does not exist except as a mode of thought, which is simply the effort of the thinker to posit himself as an absolute principle and to refer all things to himself. True and fruitful thought consequently is not that which is in accord with any definite and fixed object, but that which moves in harmony with the stream of tendency and is carried upon the outspread wings of the time-spirit. There is, in fact, no truth, but only opinions; no color, but only shades, and we must, therefore, abandon as utterly hopeless the effort to know things in themselves, and content ourselves with studying their evolutions; throw aside metaphysics and psychology as the childish toys of an infantine race, and take up in their stead history and criticism. The characteristic mark of the true critic is a disinterested curiosity, and that this word has in English only a bad and feminine sense Mr. Arnold thinks a grievance. The critic does not search for the truth which does not exist, but he seeks to supple his mind so that he may be able to see things on all sides, and remain an enlightened and impartial spectator of the dissolving views of a world which is only an eternal flux; and that his appreciation may be the keener he becomes a part of all that he beholds. He is a citizen of the universe and moves in calm indifference in all times and places, amongst all religions and philosophies. He, however, has an unmistakable penchant for religious discussions, as though after having denied the reality of God and the soul he were still haunted by their phantoms. He is capable, even as M. Renan, Ewald, and Mr. Arnold have shown, of a sort of poetical and sad devoutness, which, if it were not ridiculous, would be pathetic. He has no toleration for the unintelligent and vulgar rage against religion which is manifested by popular liberalism and atheism. When Professor Clifford breaks out into violent invectives and calls Christianity an awful plague, Mr. Arnold in a sweet and winning tone gives him a gentle rebuke, though his anger is not aroused in this instance as it was by Bishop Wilberforce, when he spoke of laboring for the honor and glory of God. "One reads it all," he says, "half sighing, half smiling, as the declamation of a clever and confident youth, with the hopeless inexperience, irredeemable by any

cleverness of his age. Only when one is young and headstrong can one thus prefer bravado to experience, can one stand by the Sea of Time, and instead of listening to the solemn and rhythmical beat of its waves, choose to fill the air with one's own whoopings to start the echo." His writings, in fact, he takes the trouble to inform us, have no other object than to save the Christian religion from its friends, who by teaching that it is inseparable from specific dogmas are placing it and themselves in fatal antagonism to the time-spirit and the critic, who is its prophet. In reality the essential thought of culturism, as conceived by the school from which Mr. Arnold has drawn his opinions, does not differ from that of mysticism or any of the other forms of modern pantheism. Its distinguishing characteristic is found not in its idea but in its temper. As an intellectual theory it is purely pantheistic. It regards the universe as its own final and efficient cause, and maintains that it is absurd to affirm the existence of any being distinct from the cosmos; and hence it teaches that God is not a person who knows and loves, but a "stream of tendency," a law, a modality; or, to take M. Renan's definition, the form under which we conceive the ideal, as space and time are the forms under which matter is made intelligible to us. God is only the category of the ideal, and when the German pantheists declare that man makes God, that man creates God in thinking of Him, they do not mean to blaspheme or to be smart, but merely pronounce a logical conclusion from their own theories. But when men who make God a modality, a form of thought, talk about saving the Bible and Christianity, we have a perfect right to turn away from them as solemn triflers in a matter which, least of all, admits of such proceeding. The idea then of culturism is pantheistic, which is the equivalent of atheistic; and as atheism is the negation of religion, any attempt to bring about an alliance between religion and culture, upon the intellectual basis offered by the critical school, is preposterous, for the simple reason that the hypothesis which this school accepts as true, makes religion impossible. When M. Renan and Mr. Arnold assure us that they do not seek to weaken the religious sentiment but to purify it, we can but liken them to a physician who in order to purge out the humors of the blood should think it necessary first to destroy life.

A religion of sweetness and light in a Godless world, which crushes beneath the iron wheel of fate the weak and the helpless, and has no favors except for the strong, is a piece of Mephistophelean irony, compared with which the pessimism of Schopenhauer is as soothing as the quiet landscape to one who flies from the feverish life of the noisy crowd. Is it not enough that these men are persuaded that there is no God and no soul? Why should they come to us proclaiming that the earth is only a charnel-house, and

in the same breath grow eloquent over the refreshing and refining influence which this discovery of theirs must have upon those who are able to appreciate its importance? To be just, however, I must leave Mr. Arnold to bear alone the burden of this officious piety. One must be an Englishman to be able to deny God and still continue to preach with all the unction of a Methodist exhorter. M. Renan is consistent, and therefore assumes a different tone. He is absolutely without zeal or the spirit of proselytism. He has nothing to say of the beneficent influence of sweetness and light; he seems rather disposed to think that when the whole truth is known existence may become unbearable; that the planets in which life is extinct are probably those in which criticism has achieved its work. He eschews controversy, and takes little interest in the questions which occupy the thoughts of men. His aims are purely speculative, and have no relevancy to contemporaneous events. He is an artist, seated on the brow of a hill, who sketches the landscape, but has nothing in common with the herds that graze upon the plain below. He is in fact a quietist, and from the eminence of his exceptional position surveys the world with a feeling akin to that which a spirit from some higher sphere might be supposed to have in contemplating the busy, fussy little ants that jostle one another on this mole-hill of an earth. God is only an idea; nature exists, but is immoral; good and evil are alike indifferent to her; and history, from an ethical point of view, is a permanent scandal. This is the final word of culture as revealed by M. Renan, and he naturally enough partakes of the Buddhist temper, to which annihilation appears to be the supreme good. And this is doubtless the mood which culture, as understood by the critical school, tends to produce. Its intellectual principle is pantheism, its ethical principle is the identity of the good and the beautiful, and historically it evolves itself either into the animalism of the senses or into the quietism of a fatalistic philosophy; and whichever form it assumes, it must inevitably fail to make reason and the will of God prevail.

But one may surely be a lover of culture without being forced to adopt the principles of M. Renan and Mr. Arnold; as one may be reasonable and yet hold to positive beliefs; as one may have taste without denying conscience.

Culture may indeed easily become the insidious foe of revealed religion, but it may also be its serviceable ally; and since in our day many of the most thoroughly trained and versatile minds are employed in the service of unbelief, it is certainly most desirable, and from a human point of view even necessary, that they be met by intellects of equal discipline and power. We are living in an epoch of transition. The decay of faith in the Protestant sects is

accelerated by the consciousness that their existence is a contradiction of the fundamental principle of Protestantism ; and among Catholics a widespread indifference, and new modes of thought created by the scientific developments of the age, have cooled the zeal and weakened the faith of many. The wavering of religious belief has unsettled all other things, so that nothing seems any longer to rest upon a firm and immovable basis. The new theories are in the air, and precautionary measures are ineffectual, at least with regard to society in general. There has never been a time in the world's history, in which the influence of literature was so all-pervading as at present, and this power is in great measure anonymous and irresponsible. Reviews and newspapers discuss everything and are read by everybody, so that any youth is prepared to pronounce you an authoritative judgment as to whether there is a God or a hell. The gravest and most sacred subjects are treated in a mock-serious tone which is worse than open blasphemy. The old Protestant controversy is as obsolete as the dress of the Pilgrim Fathers. Questions of grace, election, and free-will, have ceased to have any interest for men, who, insisting upon their right of private judgment and the supremacy of the individual mind, are puzzled to know whether God or the soul exists ; and the famous ministerial jousts, in which the doughty champions were wont to brandish their favorite texts like flaming swords, have lost their dramatic effect and are grown altogether tame in the eyes of a generation which hears every day that the Bible itself is but the fairy tale of an ignorant and superstitious age. Every true Protestant, from the necessities of his position, has made overtures to the enemies of Christianity, as the logical inference implied in the traditional Protestant warfare on the Church is that the religion of Christ is not supernatural and divine ; for if the Church is what Protestants have always said she is, then is historical Christianity but one of the world's superstitions, and of a kind with Buddhism, Paganism, and Mohammedanism. The old disputes will doubtless survive for a time, and individuals and even classes may be helped by them, but the real issue, so far as the active mind of the age is concerned, has already been transferred to quite other grounds, and it is the immediate and urgent duty of Catholics to fit themselves for the new conflict, which is not between the Church and the sects, but between the Church and infidelity. The argument is to be made fundamental and exhaustive. All philosophies and sciences are to be interrogated ; all literatures to be studied ; all forms of belief are to be analyzed ; all methods are to be used ; and the infinitely great and the infinitesimally small are to be required to give up their secret. The religious import of the sciences is precisely what lends to this study its mysterious charm. The physical

comfort which may be derived from a wider and truer acquaintance with nature is of minor importance. That which the philosopher and the man of the world are yearning to learn from all this eager and ceaseless peering into the forms and workings of matter, is whether or not any authentic response will be given to the eternal questionings of the human heart about God, the soul, and the life that is to be. This restlessness and skepticism is doubtless pathological. If men had faith, they would not be tormented by the feverish anxiety to surprise God in the mysteries which he has hidden from human eye ; but they have no faith, and since it is impossible for the mind to remain indifferent to the infinite mystery which is everywhere in all that it sees and thinks, therefore do men who have ceased to believe, seek to satisfy by knowledge the inborn craving of the soul for some tidings from the inner truth of things. They will take nothing for granted, but make God himself questionable. And here at once we may perceive the arduousness of the task which is imposed upon those who are called to the defence of the faith in our day. The first step their adversaries take leads into the bottomless abyss of endless speculation and doubt. In the Protestant controversy there was the common and certain ground of the Written Word, to which in the confusion of debate it was possible to return to take bearings, while the deists of the last century agreed with their opponents in admitting the existence of God as indisputably evident to the natural reason. The argument that those who accept Christianity as a divinely revealed religion must necessarily accept the Church as its true and historical embodiment is comparatively simple, and is logical and conclusive against the Protestants, and the argument from analogy is irrefragable when used against the deist who affirms that God is the creator and ruler of the world ; and hence the common saying that there is no resting-place between Catholicism and atheism. But the new phase of infidelity would make knowledge itself inconclusive in all matters where our concern is with the absolute truth of things. It denies that there is any such truth, or at least that it is discoverable by man. I find in all the current theories of unbelief the assumption that all that can be known is the relative, and that the highest conceivable philosophy is only phenomenology. With men who hold such opinions it is impossible to reason from fixed principles. The old methods fail to reach them. All the syllogisms that can be strung together can never compass a higher truth than that which is given in the original intuition, and if this does not attain to the reality underlying the phenomenon neither will our conclusions. The assumption that knowledge is only the perception of relations, makes all discussions as to what anything is in itself appear futile and childish. Hence the contempt of the



modern schools for metaphysics and the scholastic methods. The great practical difficulty, as I take it, in successfully controverting the new theories, lies in the fact that they represent modes of viewing things rather than states of mind. They are not held as conclusions from unanswerable arguments, but as a way of accounting for phenomena which is justified by the convergence of innumerable plausibilities towards a given line of thought. It is considered to be enough that they are in accord with the tendencies of the age, and in harmony with the great time-spirit, who, as these philosophers teach, has usurped the throne of the Eternal and Omnipotent God. A few words will suffice to sketch in general outline this system, and at the same time to show how widely it prevails. It is assumed that God is not or cannot be known to be, and as philosophy is phenomenology, it starts with matter in the state in which it is possible for the mind first to detect it. Space is filled with incandescent gas, star-dust, from which the sidereal systems are evolved. This view, for the correctness of which many arguments are adduced, receives additional weight from the study of our own planet, which, beginning as an incandescent mass, has during long ages been gradually cooling. When life first appears, it is in its lowest forms, and there is progression up to man. To this point it is maintained the astronomer and the geologist are able to conduct us. The zoologist now comes to trace the descent of man, as the geologist has followed the evolution of the globe, and Mr. Darwin and others find that he has been developed by natural processes from the lowest forms of life. The question of man's special endowments thus presents itself, and the psychologist attempts to show that thought is transformed sensation, and will transformed emotion, as man is a transformed animal.

The principle of evolution is applied to the history of language and of races in philology and ethnology, and these sciences are made auxiliary to the new theories. The sociologist next appears to unravel the infinitely complicated and intricate network of human relations, and to point out how this marvellous and entangled scheme is but the product of a few rudimentary instincts. And finally, the philosopher of history proposes to account for the whole life and all the achievements of the human race by the aid of fatalistic laws. Given the race, and its surroundings, and impulse, and he will offer you a mechanical rule by which you will be able to explain everything, religion, literature, and social institutions. It would, of course, be beside my present purpose to stop to point out the absurdities and the gaps in all this, but what I wish to call attention to is the fact that this is a way of looking at the universe, and that little or nothing is gained by insisting upon errors in detail or by showing that certain data of science are in accord with

revealed truth. The fault is radical and universal, and the only effective method of dealing with it is to be sought in a comprehensive philosophy, which starting from a true theory of knowledge will embrace the whole range of science, and by correcting the false interpretations of its data, will educate men and lead them to see that a theory of the universe which excludes God is not only unintelligible but destructive of the essential principles of reason. The intellectual difficulties with which the present generation of believers have to contend, as Dr. Newman is reported to have said, are greater than in any past age. It is not possible to laugh at our adversaries unless we are content to make ourselves ridiculous. In matters of this kind sarcasm and vituperation are not only out of place, but are no better than the language of the devil. Smart hits intended for the crowd fail of effect even with the masses.

That in the end, and after never so much science and theory, the perfect wisdom of humble and trusting faith will be made only the more evident is in no way doubtful; but in the meantime Catholics may not stand as idle lookers-on, and as though they had no part or concern in this mighty and painful conflict.

It was a principle with St. Ignatius of Loyola that a Christian should have the faith which hopes everything from God, and then act as though he expected nothing except from his own exertions.

No maxim could be more applicable to the emergency of which I am writing. I know that our blessed Lord is with his Church, and that he can turn our ignorance and supineness to the good of those who love him. I know that whatever we may do we are useless servants. The prayer of the humble is better than the thoughts of the learned, and a great saint is able to do a holier work than the most perfectly cultivated genius.

All this is indisputable, and one benefit to be hoped for from a higher culture would be the power to realize more truly what we are so ready to admit in theory. My words, if addressed to those devout and saintly souls who with unutterable groanings raise to God the voice of prayer which penetrates the heavens, would be an impertinence. It may well be that were it not for these just ones we should all perish. My thought is lower and is intended for those who, in the midst of a thousand imperfections, feel that they are better fitted to fight in the plain below than to lift up hands of supplication on the holy mount.

The issue indeed is in God's keeping, but we must strive to quit ourselves like men, and as though all depended upon our skill and courage. Without thorough training and mental discipline we shall only cumber the ground and block the way.

Now, the best culture of the intellect has for three centuries been

made impossible to Catholics who speak English, and even yet it can hardly be said to be within our reach. If we see fit, however, to make use of the means which are in our hands we can hasten the day when it will be attainable. To speak the truth frankly, the Catholics of the United States are in this respect the very last to show a disposition to take advantage of their providential opportunities. Ireland has its university, England has its university, Canada has its university, and we have nothing but the old Latin school, founded nearly a century ago. If Americans in general are justly chargeable with lack of culture, may not this charge be brought home with even greater force to American Catholics? What other proof of this is needed than our self-complacency? We speak of our numbers as though the kingdom of God consisted in numbers, and as though the increase of the Catholic population were not merely a part of a general and wider growth. We boast of our schools, and do not think it necessary to stop to inquire what they really are or what kind of education they give. We dwell with pride upon the number of churches which have been built, and the number of dioceses which have been organized, as if this were not a certain consequence of the influx and outspread of a vast Catholic population. We praise the devotedness and generosity of our Catholics as though this were not chiefly the blossoming of the faith of a people who have suddenly escaped into the open air of freedom from the bitter night of three centuries of martyrdom.

This self-complacent temper does not dispose men to take a wide and enlightened view of the wants of the Church. So long as we are content with a progress for which we deserve little credit, and which is often more apparent than real, there is small hope that any serious effort will be made to create a higher spiritual and intellectual life among our Catholic people.

---

THE PRESENT POLITICAL CONDITION OF IRELAND.

*Acta et Decreta Synodi Plenariæ Episcoporum Hiberniæ Habitæ apud Maynutiam, An. MDCCCLXXV.* Dublin: Typis Browne et Nolan, MDCCCLXXVII.

*The Speeches and Public Letters of the Liberator.* By M. F. Cusack. Dublin: McClaghlan & Gill, 50 Upper Sackville Street, 1875. 2 vols.

*The Miscellaneous Works of the Rt. Hon. Sir James Mackintosh.* Three vols., complete in one. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co., 1856.

*New Ireland.* By A. M. Sullivan, M.P. P. F. Collier, 1878.

WE purpose in this paper to offer a sketch of the present political state of Ireland. This we are well aware is a delicate task, owing to the conflicting aims of the different political parties. "A good book," says Count de Maistre, "is not one that satisfies everybody, otherwise there never would be a good book; a good book is one which satisfies the reader of the good faith of the author and of the labor he has taken to master his subject, and, if possible, to present it under a new aspect." In something of this spirit we sit down to write. We do not propose to set forth and advocate any line of action of our own, but rather to give that acted or being acted upon by others. If the writer has any political leanings, they will leak out in the course of this article.

During the last eighteen years of the last century Ireland was acknowledged to be an independent country—the declaration ran that "the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland should alone make laws for Ireland." Delusive phrase! The King of Ireland was the king of England. Who were the Lords? Not the old aristocracy to whom the Irish used to look up with pride. Sixty years before, Swift in his sarcastic way said that the real nobility of Ireland could be found in the "Liberties"—that is the poorest parts of Dublin. Most of the Lords were men who owed their elevation not to great services rendered to their country, but were rather like Lord Clare, whose father Fitzgibbon was a Catholic in humble sphere, but did not follow in the footsteps of his ancestors, who "chose to suffer persecution with the people of God rather than have the pleasure of sin for a time." Who were the Commons? Not men elected to represent the views and interests of the country. Of three hundred members, two-thirds were the nominees of about one hundred persons. Thus the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland formed a Parliament almost without a constituency. Yet unreal as it was, such is the potency of *home rule* of any sort, that during

the few years of its existence Ireland made greater strides in prosperity than any other country in Europe.

We are not to suppose that England yielded this measure of independence with a hearty good-will. The lion in the jungle relaxes his hold on his prey only to pounce on it again. The government intended to reassert the supremacy of the English Parliament on the first opportunity; and this was soon offered by the Regency question. George III. became insane. Pitt resolved to put the crown, so to speak, in commission, and make the great Seal of England equal to the royal signature; but the Irish Parliament declared the Prince of Wales *Regent* in the *interim*. Here was a conflict of authority. Pitt determined this dualism of government should not exist. The doom of the Irish Parliament was sealed. *Virtus an dolus quis in hoste requirat?* Every means was resorted to. The Catholics were cajoled with the hope of emancipation. The Presbyterians, who were then troublesome in the North, were pacified by the *regium donum*, or an annual sum voted to support their ecclesiastical college. The Episcopalians were secured by money or peerages; and the obstinate were trampled down by horse, foot, and dragoons. The Act of Union was carried and Ireland in the year 1800 ceased to be a nation.

The spirit of the country seemed broken. The very men whose eloquence in opposition to the Union electrified the people in less than five years, with few exceptions, were either judges or high civil functionaries. O'Connell witnessed all this. He was just entering on his career, being admitted to the bar in 1798. From the very first he resolved on the two great labors of his life,—Catholic emancipation and repeal of the Union. He succeeded in the first, but failed in the second.

It would be presumption in the present writer to attempt to pass judgment on the career of O'Connell. *Defunctus amabitur idem* was proven in his case. His ablest English opponents eulogized him after death. We were, therefore, surprised at an article in the great *Review* partly founded by himself, in which it was asserted that with all his ability he was more of a demagogue than a statesman. He is compared to Edmund Burke, and the comparison is unfavorable to O'Connell. He must have studied all Burke's great disquisitions on political philosophy. The stars in the heavens are not jealous because one may be more brilliant than the other. Great men do not feel jealous when their paths do not cross nor interfere with each other; and O'Connell was not jealous of Burke, and certainly he did not follow his example. Whether O'Connell ever could have been a great statesman may be relegated to "the unknowable," because he had no state to administer. Had he had Ireland for the Irish, perhaps he might have exhibited many of the

qualities which the *Dublin Review*,<sup>1</sup> as most men do, admires in the great Anglo-Irish statesman. O'Connell discarded philosophical disquisition and deliberately entered on the course of an *agitor*—a course in which he persevered through good report and evil report to the hour of his death. This he himself assures us in his reply to the Earl of Shrewsbury. At one time his annual professional emoluments were £8000 or nearly \$40,000. He says of himself:

"If I had abandoned politics, even the honors of my profession and its highest stations lay fairly before me. But I dreamt a day-dream—was it a dream?—that Ireland still wanted me; that although the Catholic aristocracy and gentry of Ireland had obtained most valuable advantages from Emancipation, yet the benefits of good government had not reached the great mass of the Irish people, and could not reach them unless the Union should be either made a reality, or else unless that hideous measure should be abrogated.

"I did not hesitate as to my course. My former success gave me personal advantages, which no other man could easily procure. I flung away the profession—I gave its emoluments to the winds—I closed the vista of its honors and dignities—I embraced the cause of my country; and come weal or come woe, I have made a choice at which I have never repined, nor ever shall repent."

Whenever another man arises with O'Connell's powers and self-devotion to the cause of his country, the days of Home Rule will be nigh.

But though O'Connell was the Gylippus on whom rested the hopes of the Catholics, he received great assistance from distinguished Protestants. Henry Grattan soon after his entrance into the House of Commons became the standard-bearer of their cause; but with all his earnestness he was in many ways unaccommodating towards the very people he labored to emancipate. Grattan, as we learn from his life written by his son, studied closely the great writers of antiquity with a view to bring their experience to bear on the political questions of his day. Yet, notwithstanding all his researches, he could not divest himself of certain fears of his Catholic countrymen. He seemed to overlook the plain truth that allegiance is merely a civil duty; and that loyalty and obedience are all that government need claim from its subjects. He desired to give the government a veto on the appointment of the Bishops, and that Catholic members of Parliament should swear they would not do this thing or that—restricting their actions where others were free; thereby putting them almost in the condition of a delegate from Dakota, who can speak but not vote on questions affecting the interests of his Territory. After Grattan's death, another great advocate of the cause was Lord Plunkett. By one speech he gained twenty-one votes, a triumph never before obtained in the House of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Dublin Review*, October, 1875.

Commons. Thus, though exclusion from Parliament was originally wrought by Protestants, the Catholics of Ireland can never forget that it was by Protestant votes their disabilities were removed.

But the most effective support O'Connell received was from the great body of the Catholic clergy and independent yeomanry, for there were even then thousands such. At first he stood almost alone. The few Catholic lords and most of the bishops kept aloof; their own social status was tacitly recognized and they scarcely aspired to anything more. For twenty years the burden of the cause was thrown on him; during that period he received only £74 or about \$350. But there was the great *residuum* of patriotism in the parochial clergy and independent farmers. To these he addressed himself, and not in vain. Like Antæus,<sup>1</sup> his strength was renewed when he touched the mother earth. He needed not to waste his energies in organizing meetings through the country, for they were ready at his hand. Had he had a hundred tongues he could not have addressed them all, for there were over two thousand Catholic churches in Ireland and they were filled every Sunday. When Mass was over, the people resolved themselves into parochial meetings. The Catholic priests were of the people, and several of them were almost rivals of O'Connell in eloquence. Through the instrumentality of these meetings the spirit of the country was roused, bigotry was awed into submission, and emancipation was gained.

O'Connell now rested for awhile. He wished to watch the effects of emancipation on the country. It should be borne in mind that he never aimed at separation. He was too experienced a man to be ensnared in the vagaries of ideal liberty. Pure liberty dwelt once on this globe of ours, but only for a short time, and never will again, except among those whom the Son of Man makes truly free. In political as in other human affairs we must put up with a partial good. The seminal principles of the British Constitution were sown in Catholic times, and it now contains the great safeguards of rational liberty. Most of the ideas embodied in the United States Constitution are borrowed from it. What O'Connell desired was that the spirit and not the letter of the Constitution should be extended to Ireland, that the Union should be one not only of two countries but a real one of two people, and that its benefits should be felt in Kerry as fully as in Kent. In England the curfew no longer tolls to warn the people to extinguish the light; no, they can lie down or rise when they please, or as their avocations demand. The English delight in manly exercises and the free use of the gun; they can travel by day and by night, and have none to

---

<sup>1</sup> This figure is applied to O'Connell by Lord Bulwer.

fear but the highway robber. No policeman dare interfere except when armed with a sworn warrant. All these and several other benefits of the Constitution the Englishman claims as his birth-right. Why should not the Irish enjoy them just as well, if the Union be a reality? But they do not. The *habeas corpus* act has been suspended constantly in three-fourths of the country; no man, however law-abiding, can carry a musket unless under the strictest conditions; and any petty constable, who labors to become a sergeant, can enter at any hour of the night and disturb the most helpless family. The excuse was and is, you cannot trust the Irish. Why not? Men do not generally rise against a government that protects and elevates them. "Moralize the laws," said Grattan, "and you moralize the people." Here in America this is simple enough; but the English could not purge themselves of their 'traditional' fears and prejudices against the Irish. O'Connell saw that he should take up the great question of Repeal.

The die was cast. His course was mapped out, and henceforth there was to be no hesitation. He again threw himself on his country, and was greeted with the most wonderful reception known to ancient or modern times. He analyzed the Act of Union, and exposed its enormities. He proved by the speeches of the ablest men in the Irish Parliament that it was in every respect unfair and unjust; in fact that it was a new conquest, and was not binding in conscience, and was to be obeyed only as a matter of expediency. *Ireland*, which had only a *small* debt, was forced to bear an unequal share of the enormous *English* public debt, in the contracting of which she had no part. He demonstrated that Ireland had not a fair representation in the Imperial Parliament. According to the basis of representation in England, in a Parliament of 658 members, Ireland should have at least 178 members, whereas she has only 105. The electoral franchise is also unfairly restricted in Ireland, and remains so to the year of grace 1879, as a few figures from Thom's Official Directory will prove. Mayo with a population of 245,707 has only 3375 Parliamentary electors, while Denbighshire with 84,875 has 7315. The city of Limerick with a population of 49,853 has only 1804 electors; but Bedford (England) with only 16,850 has 2468 electors. Besides, by the Reform Act of 1832 every county in England with more than 50,000 inhabitants got an increase of one member, those counties with more than

---

<sup>1</sup> "They say it is the fatal destiny of that land that no purposes whatsoever which are for good will prosper or take good effect, which, whether it proceed from the very *genius* of the soil, or influence of the stars, or that Almighty God hath not yet appointed the time of her reformation, or that He reserveth her in this unquiet state still for some secret scourge which shall by her come unto England, is hard to be known, but yet much to be feared."—Spenser's View, etc.



100,000 inhabitants got an increase of two members. But no such boon was extended to Ireland. These and various other arguments O'Connell employed to stir up the spirit of the people.

When O'Connell commenced the Repeal agitation he was about fifty-eight years old; not too old certainly to discharge the most important affairs of life, but in his special instance it was a great misfortune that he was not twenty years younger. Of the tried friends who stood by him during the long struggle for emancipation, some were dead; many, having secured to themselves the avenue to place and honor, grew cold and fell away; and others, such as Moore, flung the galling shaft of ridicule against him. The Catholic clergy stood faithful; but he was compelled almost to begin anew and gather around him a fresh body of talented men whom he could inspire with his own principles, and in whom he could confide. But this was the work of years, and his years were growing few. O'Connell boasted that he knew the law so well that he could drive a coach through its most difficult and narrowest paths; but he was made to feel that, like the ancient philosopher, he could not argue with a general at the head of forty thousand men. No matter how penetrating and comprehensive the mind of any man may be others will look at things differently, and will dwell on his mistakes. So it happened to O'Connell. Young men seeing his discomfiture began to disregard his counsels as either vacillating or timid. Impatient of restraint and delay, they adopted a different course, but they were quickly overwhelmed in disaster.

Of the prominent men who formed what is known as the Young Ireland party the writer would not speak with disrespect. They differed from O'Connell on principle. His ways and means of redressing national wrongs are well known; they are fully explained in the two volumes at the head of this article. To be brief we quote his ideas and not his words. He took a very serious and religious view of life. Wars he looked on as an abomination. In armies are encamped on a vast scale all the vices and crimes that degrade men and send their souls to hell. Hence he could not endure an appeal to the sword as the remedy for Ireland's wrongs.

The Young Ireland party took a different view. They thought O'Connell's principles were a damper on the national spirit, and also that they were not sustained by the facts of history. In other words, on the question must national wrongs be remedied solely by moral persuasion, or is a recourse to arms or physical force never allowable, there were two clashing principles. In their application to Ireland on this occasion both failed. Repeal was not carried by argument, and separation was not accomplished by the sword. But if O'Connell failed in this instance he succeeded on

other occasions ; whereas, thus far, the sword has not wrought the independence of Ireland.

And here we hope we may be pardoned some reflections, as we may have occasion to refer to this subject again.

We do not read in the Gospel the principle of resistance to established power ; but we do find that men were commanded to obey a government that persecuted them. The Catholic Church is opposed to revolution *per se*, but she has not committed herself to the doctrine of passive obedience at all times and under all circumstances. She has lived through many stormy periods of revolution, and though pronouncing no authoritative solution of the difficulty in her official capacity for the guidance of her children, her theologians have elaborated the question in all its bearings. We could fill pages from their writings, but it might seem an affectation of learning we do not possess. We will content ourselves with the reflections of *Sir James Mackintosh*, who, we are inclined to think, borrowed them from the great Catholic theologians.

He says that in the awful conjunctures when men deliberate between rendering legal obedience and an appeal to arms, their conduct, considering the time, place, opinion, example, temptation, and obstacles, must be judged by the immutable principles of morality. He considers war in general ; and points out that there may be occasions in which a war even in self-defence by a nation may be unjustifiable. By the same principles he examines into the justice of a war by a people against their own government. Government exists to protect men from each other's injustice, and this duty it cannot perform without obedience from the people. But when a government systematically oppresses a people, it commits the same species of wrong towards them which warrants an appeal to arms against a foreign enemy. Thus far civil and foreign war stand on the same moral foundation ; but he draws this grave difference between the two. Though the passage be lengthy, owing to its grave importance, we give it without a verbal alteration.<sup>1</sup> He thus continues :

" But there are certain peculiarities of great importance in point of fact, which in other respects permanently distinguish them from each other. The evils of failure are greater in civil than in foreign war. A State generally incurs no more than a loss in war : a body of insurgents is exposed to ruin. The probabilities of success are more difficult to calculate in cases of internal contest than in a war between States, where it is easy to compare those merely material means of attack and defence which may be measured or numbered. An unsuccessful revolt strengthens the power and sharpens the cruelty of the tyrannical ruler, while an unfortunate war may produce little of the former evil and of the latter nothing. It is almost peculiar to intestine war that success may be as mischievous as defeat. The victorious leaders may be borne along by the current of events far beyond their destination ; a government may be overthrown

---

<sup>1</sup> Review of the Causes of the Revolution of 1688, chap. 9, p. 382.

which ought to have been only repaired ; and a new, perhaps more formidable, tyranny may spring out of victory. A regular government may stop before its fall becomes precipitate, or check a career of conquest when it threatens destruction to itself ; but the feeble authority of the chiefs of insurgents is rarely able, in the one case to maintain the courage, in the other to repress the impetuosity of their voluntary adherents. Finally, the cruelty and misery incident to all warfare are greater in domestic dissension than in contests with foreign enemies."

Then pointing out some of the special evil consequences of civil war, such as the loss of virtue, the estrangement of families, the perpetuation of feuds, etc., he concludes :

"A wanton rebellion, when considered with the aggravation of its ordinary consequences, is one of the greatest crimes. The chiefs of an inconsiderable and ill-concerted revolt, however provoked, incur the most formidable responsibility to their followers and country. An insurrection rendered necessary by oppression and warranted by a reasonable probability of a happy termination is an act of public virtue, always environed with so much peril as to merit admiration."

The leaders of the new departure read and knew all this, for Smith O'Brien, Gavan Duffey, John Dillon, and other prominent men were men of extensive information. The writer of this remembers having had many and long conversations regarding the crisis, though it may be indelicate to mention it, with the late Richard Dalton Williams, one of the greatest of men, and the poet, almost *par excellence*, of the *Nation*. His complaint was that himself and friends were openly denounced as at least almost infidels, when they felt conscious they were not. They thought "they had a reasonable probability of a happy termination," for they had on paper an army of over tens of thousands of men. The country clubs sent in the most glowing accounts ; young men on the threshold of manhood convinced of their own sincerity and courage would promise to make any sacrifice. They had yet these two withering lessons to learn ; that there may be betrayers in their midst, and that personal courage without military discipline and training is of little avail ; for to the eyes of the bravest civilian the veriest coward clad in the panoply of war generally seems to be a giant.

• In critical times the people clamor for success, and scarcely have eyes to see or ears to hear the causes of failure. Smith O'Brien, trusting to the paper army returned by the clubs, cast himself upon the country, and found too late that the foregoing reflections were too true. He could, however, have destroyed hundreds of her Majesty's army, as we know from trustworthy men who were on the spot. Wellington said a tender-hearted man was unfit to be a general. O'Brien revolted from unavailing bloodshed. He saw that all was lost ; he was not backed by even a respectable part of the nation. He himself has left on record that he was willing to

sacrifice his life for his country, but he was not willing to head a *jacquerie*. He was right. His life and fortunes were wrecked; but we are pretty certain that his good name will never be disparaged in Ireland. And when, in 1859, he visited America, he was received in a private way, because he so wished it, with marked courtesy by the first men of every section of the United States and Canada.

Again, as half a century before, the cause of Ireland seemed to be dead; but it was not. A new party was organized on the Land question as a basis. Certainly it did not effect what it aimed at; but it helped to keep alive the spirit of the people; it made manifest the grievous thralldom of the tenant farmers, and, perhaps, ultimately led to the *modicum* of legal protection now awarded them. Some few used the organization as a stepping-stone to power, though almost sworn to hold themselves independent of the government. But they soon fell from "their bad eminence," and made their exit from the stage of life after the manner of Castle-reagh.

Had the British Government, after a reasonable time, forgotten the *emeute* of '48, as she would have done had it occurred in Yorkshire, tranquillity and, perhaps, contentment would soon have been restored. She would only have acted on the political maxims of her own best statesmen. But instead of doing so, the occasion was used as a plea for renewed oppression. Insult was added to defeat. The doctrine of the inalienable right to revolutionize was still preached up in the English press. The Irish were taunted with the sneer, that they could fight bravely everywhere except at home, though they were designedly deprived of arms with which to fight. But if the right to revolution be so universal, can loyalty be a virtue? Such a right is a mockery; it means the right to be shot. Under such circumstances in 1825, Bishop Doyle wrote of the Irish: "Reject them, insult them, continue to deprive them of hope, and they will league with Beelzebub against you. Revenge is sweet, and the pride of a nation, like the vanity of a woman, when wounded, is relentless." Just so.

Of the lesser lights among the men of '48, there were still some in Ireland who adhered to the plan of armed revolution. Seeing the utter failure of open warfare, they resolved to work by means of secret societies. They put themselves in connection with leaders of the *Commune* and Lodges on the Continent, and copied their methods of operation. In due time outcropped the vastly ramified organization known as the *Fenian Society*. It was spread not only through Ireland and England, but assumed a bold and imposing appearance in the United States. All things seemed favorable to

its plans for a time, but when the day for action came we know the result—sad discomfiture.

The organization is slowly dying out, and we do not wish to revive agitation on the subject. That several of the leaders were opposed to all religion, and would wish to inspire irreligious views into their followers, is well known. But we by no means imagine that the great majority of the members of the society intended to upset the Catholic Church. And last year, when a man of singular ability as a writer, Charles Kickham, fell into financial embarrassments, we find that persons of all creeds and parties, headed by the Catholic archbishop of his own diocese, contributed generously to his relief.

But good impulses on the part of many of its members could not justify the society. It was impracticable and wrong in principle. Experience has proven, especially in Ireland, that no society can be so easily betrayed as oath-bound secret societies. It was so with the United Irishmen in '98. The government was regularly informed of all their plans. The Fenians found it so in 1865. Notwithstanding all their oaths of secrecy, the government was able to anticipate all their movements. Governments live by force, and will meet and crush all armed opposition, be it public or private. This is an elementary truth.

It is strange that the promoters of the movement did not seem to anticipate any opposition from the United States. The government must enforce its own treaties. It was at peace with England and could not allow armed expeditions against a friendly power to be fitted out within its borders. To allow it would be tantamount to a declaration of war. The leaders were permitted all freedom of public discussion, but when they began to act they found themselves checked by the United States Army. Thus they had not only England, but also the United States Government against them. Those who put themselves outside the pale of the civil law must expect that the law will oppose them.

It is well known that the Church is opposed on principle to secret revolutionary societies. Some have insisted that the Church has not expressly condemned the Fenian Society here in America. But she has. We have the decision before us, but deem it unnecessary to give its actual words.<sup>1</sup> We presume it is left to the discretion of the Ordinaries to publish and enforce it. The reason why the Church condemns secret oath-bound societies is very simple. Without going into the depths of theology, no man has a right to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Sæ Sedis*, vol. vi., in note on the *Constitution Apostolicæ Sedis*.

take an oath except for a known and just purpose, and under proper sanctions and authority. The Catechism teaches children that it is sinful to take a rash oath, and it is sinful to keep it.

The leaders caring little for, or forgetting the principles by which the Church is governed, have not hesitated to ascribe unworthy motives to its clergy. Priests ordained at Maynooth have been singled out for special obloquy. It was charged that they took an oath to maintain the British Government, and, therefore, it was that they opposed the movement. In America we are free. No English gold purchases the Church here, and yet she condemns the society. As to the Maynooth priests, they differ in nothing from priests ordained elsewhere. With us, when the government confers any special trust on a citizen, it requires such a person to renew his oath of allegiance; thus a sheriff or a postmaster, before he enters on his duties, must take such an oath. This is precisely what is required of priests at Maynooth. By the fact of their birth they were already bound; but as they are made the recipients of a special favor, they are required, as is done elsewhere, to renew their allegiance.

The Holy Father even did not escape censure. It was asserted that he favored England at the expense of Ireland. England has never been very friendly to the Popes. In Catholic times she grumbled at paying the Peter's pence. By the *Præmunire* Act she made it a penal offence to publish the Pope's Apostolic Letters. There can be no special reason, therefore, why the Pope should compromise Ireland to gratify England. The duties of the Holy Father extend to peoples and governments the most distant and diverse. He has to rebuke the despotism of Russia; he has to resist the cruel tyranny of Germany, and the butchery of the *Commune* in France; and, when the occasion demands, he hesitates not to pronounce censure on secret societies in Ireland.

There have been occasions in days gone by when the Popes feared not to come to the assistance of Ireland. We will refer only to one eventful period. When the Confederate Catholics, in 1642, rose to defend their religion and country, the Pope promptly aided them with money and arms. He commissioned a Nuncio to counsel and encourage them. But Ormond, a man of subtle and treacherous intellect, baffled his plans and caused division among the Confederates. The Nuncio was compelled to excommunicate the party that thwarted him. Ormond had theologians in his council. They raised the question then agitated in France, whether the right of patronage to Episcopal sees was not vested in the Crown; and also the other more serious question, whether a General Council was above the Pope. If so, the censures of the Nuncio

could be disregarded, even though ratified at Rome.<sup>1</sup> The scheme succeeded. The two ablest generals in the Confederate army, O'Neill and Preston, instead of fighting the common enemy, actually marched their armies against each other. Thus while they were arguing about the discussions of the Sorbonne and the *liberties of the Gallican Church*, Ormond was enabled to crush the liberties, not only of the Church, but of Ireland. Had the Infallibility of the Pope been then defined as an article of faith, such controversies could not have occurred, and the condition of Ireland would be very different from what it is to-day.

But perhaps we have written at unnecessary length on this topic.

The movement which at present occupies public attention is known as "Home Rule." It originated in 1870, chiefly under the inspiration of the late Mr. Butt. Like all new great political parties, it is viewed differently by persons of different bias. Many consider it good; others think it bad; and some look on it with indifference. Many English and Irish Protestants pretend that *Home Rule* means *Rome Rule*. Such is not the case. Rome has ruled pretty extensively in Ireland since the days of St. Patrick, and her sway is more solid to-day than ever. But Rome rules in spiritual matters, and does not aim to dictate any particular line of politics. Rome knows that Catholics and Protestants—though differing in religion—may unite on questions appertaining to the welfare of their common country, and she interposes no positive difficulty. Those who look on with indifference are either persons who are satisfied with things as they are, or such as desire separation—the Nationalists. We notice that some of the Home Rulers are not averse to receiving aid from the Nationalists. They know that the pressure of the physical argument has often been effective with the government. But notwithstanding, is not this division of forces damaging to the cause of Ireland? Though something has been conceded to revolutionary threats, it is a question whether much more could not be accomplished by a widespread, harmonious, and persevering combination of all classes of the people.

Mr. Sullivan in his book styled *New Ireland* gives the fundamental principles of the Home Rule association. They are as follows:

I. "This association is formed for the purpose of obtaining for Ireland the right of self-government by means of a National Parliament.

II. "It is hereby declared, as the essential principle of this association, that the objects, and the only objects, contemplated by its organization are:

"To obtain for our country the right and privilege of managing our own affairs, by

---

<sup>1</sup> Confederation of Kilkenny, by Rev. C. P. Meehan. Also vide Hib. Domin. and Bishop French's Unkind Deserter. Bishop French was a most prominent actor in those events.

a Parliament assembled in Ireland, composed of her Majesty the Sovereign, and her successors, and the Lords and Commons of Ireland;

“To secure for that parliament, under a federal arrangement, the right of legislating for and regulating all matters relating to the internal affairs of Ireland, and control over Irish resources and revenues, subject to the obligation of contributing our just proportion of the imperial expenditures;

“To leave to an imperial parliament the power of dealing with all questions affecting the imperial crown and government, legislation regarding the colonies and other dependencies of the crown, the relations of the United Empire with foreign States, and all matters appertaining to the defence and stability of the empire at large;

“To attain such an adjustment of the relations between the two countries, without any interference with the prerogatives of the crown, or any disturbance of the principles of the Constitution.”

III. “The association invites the co-operation of all Irishmen who are willing to join in seeking for Ireland a federal arrangement based upon these general principles.

IV. “The association will endeavor to forward the object it has in view, by using all the legitimate means of influencing public sentiment, both in Ireland and Great Britain, by taking all opportunities of instructing and informing public opinion, and by seeking to unite Irishmen of all creeds and classes in one national movement, in support of the great national object hereby contemplated.

V. “It is declared to be an essential principle of the association that, while every member is understood by joining it to concur in its general object and plan of action, no person so joining is committed to any political opinion, except the advisability of seeking for Ireland the amount of self-government contemplated in the objects of the association.”

It has been objected that these articles are too vague and do not distinguish between imperial and Irish questions. They were drawn up intentionally so, merely as a basis of organization, leaving to the proper time to define terms and details. Home Rule implies the federal system. Many look on it as an anomaly in Irish politics, and think it will not work. But even now the outward form of the connection with England is federative. Cromwell discarded circuitous ways and troubled himself but little about Articles of Union. He ordered that members from among his followers in Ireland should be sent to his Parliament at Westminster. The Union of 1800 also was actually a conquest, but the external legal forms were observed. The official style and title of the kingdom is, “the United Kingdom of Great Britain *and* Ireland.” Scotland is merged into Britain, but Ireland is mentioned separately. Ireland has also an executive of its own, the Lord-Lieutenant and Council. It has also a separate judiciary; so there is still something of the federal system left in existence. Repeal involved the federal system. Mr. Sullivan states that O’Connell could not give a clear outline of what he meant by simple repeal. We think he is mistaken. In the volumes already quoted, O’Connell mentions some of the difficulties attending repeal, but he did not think them unsurmountable. The English Parliament, if it granted repeal, could by an act make all the necessary alterations so as to adapt it to the changed condition of the countries.



Thus the federal idea is not altogether new in Ireland. The principles of Home Rule embodied in the resolutions have been explained on many and various occasions since they were first promulgated. Home Rule means the perpetuation of the connection with England. In its very nature it is complex. Its advocates know that mathematical precision is not to be expected in constitutions of government; in fact, it would be a positive injury, as the most logical form of government is a puny despotism. Constitutional governments are made up of checks and balances. In federal governments it is not always easy to draw the line that separates home from national questions. Under the United States Constitution it has cost much thought and trouble to ascertain the line dividing questions appertaining to the State and to the General Government. Yet few will hazard the assertion that the legislature of Pennsylvania is a mere empty bauble without the power of doing good. So also a federal Parliament assembled in Dublin could render incalculable services to Ireland. It would have control over the education question, the land question, and the reclaiming the waste places, the encouragement of manufactures; in a word, all the various matters that with us are reserved to the State legislatures. Ought Ireland to reject what New York is content with? It would be well if she could only secure it. Some influential men in Ireland object again that Home Rule would degrade the Irish peerage. A peer sitting in a federal Parliament, they say, would make a sorry figure. They seem to forget that the peerage, since the Union, has been degraded. Irish peers, as such, cannot sit in the imperial Parliament. Only a certain number, twenty-one we believe, can enter, and they are voted for from among themselves when a vacancy occurs; whereas English peers take their seat by virtue of their creation. Besides, would there not arise questions in the Irish Parliament worthy of the attention of the proudest peer? It is further objected that still the army and navy would belong to England; but only in a qualified sense. The advocates of Home Rule insist that Ireland has helped largely to build up the vast fabric of the British Empire, and has, therefore, a just claim to share her greatness and prosperity. Ireland would still have perhaps an enlarged representation at Westminster to watch over her interests. Thus the army and navy would belong to Ireland as well as to Great Britain, just as the United States Army and Navy may be said to belong to Illinois as well as to Massachusetts.

Such is a general outline of the Home Rule movement. It has great difficulties to encounter from within as well as from without. When Grattan was asked why he did not labor for Repeal, he said he would when backed by the nation; that he considered hopeless. Yet O'Connell combined the nation and carried emancipation. So

it may be with Home Rule. But the great difficulty is that THE MAN has not yet appeared equal to the crisis. Mr. Butt was a man of commanding abilities and large Parliamentary experience; but he had serious drawbacks, and, to use Grattan's figure, he was the oak of the forest, too old to be transplanted at fifty. He espoused the national cause too late in life to establish a firm hold on the confidence of the people. However, his example proves that it is not now necessary that a man should be a Catholic to become a great leader of the Irish people. The majority of the Irish members of Parliament are Protestants. What is demanded is ability, patience, and unswerving self-devotion to the cause of his country; and, we may add, an independent personal property. We do believe no poor man, no matter what his attainments, can sustain himself as a popular leader in Ireland. When a man steps forward as the champion of the national cause, he must expect opposition. His motives and actions will be closely scrutinized and frequently censured. There is a constant ebb and flow in public opinion; one month it bears a man aloft on the top of the crest of the wave, and the next month it casts him high and dry upon the strand. But if he possesses the requisite resources in property and purpose, he can afford to wait until the current sets in his favor again. This happened to Grattan and to O'Connell.

Circumstances that so much favored O'Connell scarcely any longer exist. The Catholic priests readily adopted his views and instilled them into their people. The priest now fills but a small place in Irish political agitation. Since 1850, under the direction of the late Cardinal Cullen, ecclesiastical discipline has undergone a great change. Priests are more confined to their official duties. Not that a man by becoming a priest thereby ceases to be a citizen, and loses his right to uphold what he believes to be the interests of his country. But, knowing the bitter passions that political contests call forth, it is deemed more proper for the priest to cease to be prominent. The Synod of Maynooth "strictly forbids priests, during the solemnity of the Mass, so plainly unbecoming, or even in the Church at all, to discuss political questions, because such discussions tend to produce division between the pastor and the people."

Besides it was considered that the time had arrived when the laymen were or should be able to understand and take care of their own political interests. In the April number of the REVIEW it was shown that the youth of Ireland have been receiving a general education. The rising generation are growing in intelligence. The fourth estate, the press, representing various shades of political opinions, is cheap and widely circulated; and under the informing influence of the Church we have little fear but that Young Ireland

will know how to turn their advantages to good account. Some, perhaps, in the heyday of life may rush into the snares of secret revolutionary societies, but the vast majority are aware that in a great national struggle the interests of a people cannot be split into classes. A nation to be strong needs the support of all her children. And whenever the right and true man appears and by trial is made manifest, he will be able to organize all these elementary forces and compel their combined voice to be heard.

Here we must stop. After all it will be urged that the adoption of these ideas would necessitate the surrender of all the aspirations for which the Irish have so long and so often bled. We would not surrender these traditions if we could. But this world is constantly undergoing changes. The governments of every existing civilized country have suffered change. Ireland cannot and should not go back to her old condition. In Catholic times the Irish asked for the benefits of the British Constitution. By united effort she can yet obtain it. England listens to the "logic of facts," and is gradually abandoning her anti-Irish bigotry. She knows where the strength and the weakness of the empire lie. She will understand that it will be strengthened by conceding Home Rule to the Irish. Under the fostering care of a domestic legislature the best characteristics of the Irish people would be preserved and perpetuated. Ireland may not be, as the poet says, "great, glorious, and free;" but she could be happy, and prosperous, and more truly than ever before, "the first flower of the earth and the first gem of the sea."

---

## SOCIALISM,<sup>1</sup> CONSIDERED IN ITS ORIGIN AND FIRST MANIFESTATIONS.

*Analyse de la Doctrine De Babeuf.* Paris, 1796.

*Théorie des Quatre Mouvements.* By Charles Fourier. Leipsig (Lyons), 1808.

*Some Barriers between Labor and Capital.* Cath. World, Nov. 1878.

THE ominous expansion of Socialism during the last few years, not only all over Europe, but, to a certain extent, even in this country, requires that all intelligent men should thoroughly understand its purposes and aims, and the means its leaders intend to adopt for their furtherance. This, until recently, appeared to many persons somewhat indistinct, so that even great political leaders paid little attention to this new sect, and acted as if it had no existence whatever. It was only yesterday, as it were, that Mr. Disraeli, who was not yet known as Lord Beaconsfield, thought proper, for the first time, to say a few words in a public speech on the advent of the monstrous *giant* on the political stage; and it was still more recently that M. de Bismarck condescended to acknowledge it and prepared to fight it out, as he is at present attempting with great energy. In his last manifesto, just before his death, M. Thiers, who ought to have appreciated it better, on account of recent events in France, called it merely *an epidemic*, as if it would be only a momentary scourge, like the yellow fever of last summer in Louisiana.

This long-enduring indifference towards socialism must have in those three influential leaders the effect of wilful blindness, for they could not but be aware that the socialistic idea is much older than they seem to suppose. Its present attitude can scarcely be understood, unless we go back to its origin and first manifestations. This will be the main object of the present paper; although, of necessity, allusion will often be made to occurrences of the day, and people will judge whether it is merely an epidemic, as M. Thiers fondly imagined.

Socialism, which under the euphuistic name of *Sociology*, has lately been made in England a branch of science, has a much more extensive meaning than that formerly assigned to it by lexicographers. They often confound it with communism; but it would be unjust now to do so, although many socialistic systems end in the

---

<sup>1</sup> A very important paper on Communism in the United States, was published in the July number of 1878. The object of this is altogether different, as the reader can easily recognize, and contains, in fact, a history of Socialism in all European countries.

community of property. The main idea of the thing itself is that of association, with the ultimate purpose of improving the condition of the lower classes, and through them, of all mankind. Thus any religious or philosophical scheme in which the amelioration of human society is considered as the theorizer's main object, can be called a socialist system. In this sense Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Campanella's *Civitas Solis*, Fenelon's *Telemachus*, and many other celebrated books of the same kind, can be rightfully designated as innocent attempts at ameliorating man's social condition. In fact, when first published, they were mainly considered as inoffensive descriptions of an impossible state of things on earth, aiming at public good, and thus they were socialistic utopias.

When these speculations are examined from a practical point of view, it is easy to see that a mere philosopher, even of the highest rank, cannot be competent to construct or arrange a social system perfectly faultless, unless he is inspired and has actually received a mission from heaven for the noble purpose he has in view. Any one who has reflected seriously on the subject, must be persuaded that human society could not have started on its career except on the supposition that God himself had assigned laws to it, as well as to everything else. If the physical world imperiously requires physical laws, much more does the moral and social order necessitate moral and social principles. Until the evolutionists furnish us the demonstration that the material creation has made itself, and follows only the blind fatality of its own falling into line without a previous design, sensible men, even if not Christians, will continue firmly to believe that God alone *could* make the world and *has* made it. Then, too, moral and social order is of a far higher character than that which is purely physical, and God is much more needed for its establishment than even for the mighty energy by which the material creation was brought into existence.

What renders many men blind to the acknowledgment of this grand truth is, that God has allowed us to co-operate with Him in the practical workings of social order; and then, too, political institutions, which in great part come from man, and the constant shifting of natural human life in the course of its history, react powerfully on social institutions and can modify them to a great extent. But all these peculiarities cannot weaken the positive fact that God is the sole author of the social order, has given it its original direction, watches with paternal care over the observance of its laws, and alone prevents it from falling into confusion by His ever present action in the moral and social, as He likewise does in the physical world. Man, therefore, undertakes more than he can do when he attempts to frame a social scheme, *de toutes piécés*, as the French say,

irrespective of the divine laws which have presided at the foundation of society and which must constantly regulate its development.

The social system is intimately connected with politics, but is far deeper, as being the necessary *substratum* of all governments. It is entirely interwoven with all the domestic concerns of man, inasmuch as the family is the first and most necessary element of society. It is inseparable also from the teachings of religion, which necessarily forms the basis of any commonwealth on earth. All these considerations are so many proofs that the human social system must have come from God's hands, and that it is the height of presumption on the part of man to think of building it up without having received a mission from heaven.

This is perfectly clear to every intelligent man who has not lost the use of his reason by too long a practice of sophism. It is true, nevertheless, that the great socialistic leaders of the day discard all this, and refuse to admit God's authority in politics, in the family, in the commonwealth, in all the concerns of man. But for this very reason all their social systems are not only untrue, but monstrous and absurd, as we hope to make clearly appear before we have done. We maintain again that no philosopher, as such, can frame for man a social system perfect in all its details, and sure to win the acceptance of all, for the reasons which have just been assigned.

It might not be unprofitable to recite again the various stages which human society has passed through from the beginning down to our own day. The hand of Providence would surely appear in the details which we might recount, and history would teach us better than philosophical speculation what social plan God has designed for man from the primitive ages, and how this plan has been in part thwarted by the follies and errors of man. But this would be beyond our scope; and we are reduced to consider only one of those social stages, the most conspicuous in fact, namely, the establishment of Christianity.

For, the social changes which the Christian religion brought into the world, are so remarkable that no one who merely opens his eyes can gainsay them; and every one is obliged to admit the truth of these words of St. Paul: *Pietas ad omnia utilis est, promissionem habens vitæ quæ nunc est et futuræ*, 1 Tim. iv. 8. This alone, is more than sufficient to prove that God's hand has founded human society, and preserved it from ruin whenever man interfered too violently with His plan. Ancient history, moreover, has been searched into of late years for this very purpose of discovering the early civilization of man, which is another name for God's plan; and if crude theories have been devised, derogatory both to man's dignity and to God's power or goodness, other inquiries have vin-

licated both, and proved the correctness of the biblical account. It is evident that if human society has often been subject to frightful evils, it is mainly because the divine designs have been opposed and resisted in all their elements, political, social, industrial, domestic, and individual. What has been well ascertained of the workings of the Christian religion on human life under all these aspects, demonstrate that it was intended to repair the wrong, and render happiness possible in human society; so that Montesquieu's saying is profoundly true: "It is wonderful indeed that Christianity, whose great object is to prepare man for a happy hereafter, is likewise the best calculated to procure his felicity in this life."

The necessary limits of this paper allow us only to furnish here a very short, and consequently imperfect sketch of this most important subject, but it cannot be altogether omitted. Despotic power of the most monstrous kind had replaced in the Roman world the former paternal forms of all *political* institutions. The *social* hierarchy of ranks in the primitive commonwealth had been totally subverted by dividing all men into the mere dualism of the few and the many, the free and the slave, both in the most extreme meaning of the terms; the former enjoying all freedom's privileges, the latter being subjected to all the horrors of the most abject servitude. Slavery had also altogether spoiled the *industrial* system, founded primitively on universal labor according to each individual's capacity. This normal rule, dating from Adam's fall, had been replaced by abject labor imposed on the slave, which rendered free corporations simply impossible. The *domestic* institution was rapidly running to its destruction by the introduction of repeated divorces, which would soon have brought on the degrading custom of promiscuity. Finally, the *individual* abandoned to himself, and free from any other restraint except that of exterior force, appeared to have at last obtained his independence, only to fall under the crushing heel of despotism.

The Christian religion, considered as a human institution—it bears also this aspect—corrected fundamentally all these fatal effects of a universal decline among the nations, and inaugurated the modern, or rather, mediæval social system. Happy, if men had better appreciated it and kept it. The Imperial Roman absolutism was replaced either by the Christian idea of moderate monarchy, or by the aristocratic governments of the mediæval republics, very different from the former Grecian democracies; all these institutions being at the same time under the control of the Pope's mediation, in case of discord among the rulers. The Third Estate soon appeared everywhere to secure the rights of the lower classes, and the great word, freedom, acquired a meaning which it never had in ancient times. This new political society was at once established on

the firmest basis by the great Christian principle that "All power comes from God." The noblest social axioms were embodied in the sublime virtue of charity—*charitas*—which remedied as far as it is possible, the evils necessarily derived from the inequality of rank, of wealth, of knowledge. It was admitted that this inequality is founded on man's nature, and that it would be sheer folly to attempt a levelling of fortunes, of power, of ideas, and that in case this should be done for a moment, it could never last owing to the immense variety of aptitudes and of opportunities which a wise Providence has decreed should entirely rule human affairs. The modern industrial system was introduced step by step, by the gradual abolition of slavery, which had rendered impossible among the ancients what we now call free industry. It was in the monasteries that free labor was first born, and there was then no conflict whatever between it and capital. There would, in fact, never have been any conflict of importance between them even in modern times, such as we witness at this day, if the old corporations and guilds, created by the Church in the Middle Ages, had not been totally destroyed first by the Reformation, and afterwards more completely still by the French Revolution. To have a sufficient idea of this, it is sufficient to consult the *History of the Reformation*, by Cobbett. No one has ever been able to confute the statements of the great English radical on the important subject he has treated. He has indeed completely unveiled the true cause of modern pauperism, which is the last expression of this frightful phenomenon of our day, viz., *the total subjection of labor by capital*. As to the results of the French Revolution, M. Taine's last work, *Origines de la France Contemporaine*, to the same effect as Cobbett's, it is impossible to refute. Finally, there is no need of dwelling on the consideration of the social unit called the family, since every one now admits, except the extreme Socialists, that the Christian ideal of it, with all its consequences, is the only one acceptable to reason and morality. Even non-Christians begin to shudder at the social decomposition produced by the introduction of divorce in marriage, and of independence among unruly children so common in our age.

All these considerations are irrespective of many other ameliorations which Christianity has introduced into human society, such as the principle of association, the smoothing away of international asperities, the introduction of humanity in war, the mildness of modern manners, etc. It is very doubtful, to say the least, if any modern theorists will ever find out a social system preferable to the one which has just been described. And it is remarkable that the immense and universal success attending it has not been confined to the first ages of the Church, when the Blessed Saviour's



doctrine spread so rapidly all over the globe, and produced such radical and beneficial changes in human society, on so large a scale. But even in our day, the same power of the true Christian apostle has exerted a like influence wherever in his zeal for man's welfare he can act without his efforts being opposed and thwarted by inveterate enemies. Thus in Paraguay, as soon as the missionaries of the Church obtained from the Kings of Spain permission to lay the foundation of their "Reductions" (as they were called) without the interference of outsiders, the Christian social idea was realized in such degree as surprised and delighted all unprejudiced minds. The most uncouth and barbarous savages learned in a few years all the arts of civilized life, and lived supremely contented in their miniature republics, happy with innocent festivities, and cheered by the sweetest emotions of religion. The only fault the most captious critics could find, was that the Indians were children, and their religious teachers not bold enough in their theories. The first defect was certainly charming as a novelty in the midst of the cold and surfeited eighteenth century, when they flourished. The second weak side of it rather pleases us as a contrast to the more than cold utopias of modern socialists, of which we shall speak presently.

It is true that in all her social schemes, Christianity assumes that man is a sinner; not a totally depraved creature, as John Calvin pretended, but inclined to evil, and rushing into it unless he effectually uses the means which God places at his disposal, and which we call divine grace. Modern socialism, on the contrary, invariably starts with the assumption that man is a perfect being, always preferring good to evil, and infallibly drawn by a powerful *attraction* towards what is conformable to his best nature. A sad experience has more than proved which is the true view of human nature; and the complete collapse, one after another, of all socialistic systems antagonistic to religion, would be another proof were it needed. After these general considerations on true *Sociology*, it is time to come to the history of Socialism itself, its true origin and first manifestations.

Before the outbreak of the French Revolution, Socialism, as it is now understood and preached, was totally unknown. If Protestantism did not give birth to it, it powerfully disposed men towards it. The social theorists, from the Middle Ages down to the latter part of the last century, were all more or less Christian, such as Roger Bacon, More, Campanella, and Fénelon. The books they wrote were, on the whole, inoffensive romances, and the most timid men could not reasonably have been frightened by the total adoption of their wildest dreams. During the second part of the last century the sect of Economists arose in France, with Turgot at

its head, and in England, Adam Smith, J. Balny, and others elaborated the system of what has been called political economy. A very remarkable feature in both these theories was the total exclusion of Christian ideas which all writers had previously connected more or less with social systems of every kind. Even those who previously had never said a word about Christianity, as Fénelon, in his Republic of Salentum—an episode of Telemachus—were evidently swayed by their Christian belief. But the new considerations on capital and labor, on the production of wealth, etc., which were the main objects of economists in England and France, took no account whatever of Christian principles, and discussed social problems in the simple light of unaided human reason and altogether irrespective of morality. But still most of the axioms on which human society had so far relied for its security, appeared to remain untouched by the new systems; and it required very careful study to detect any danger in those theories, though there certainly was. The step had been made, however, and for the first time social science boldly stalked forth in a form which was altogether independent of Christianity, and outside of every moral consideration.

The French Revolution boldly and avowedly went much further, and a few years after its first explosion, in 1789, the wildest social theories began to assume shape, and were not only *emancipated*, as the word has it, from all religious notions (as were those of the economists) but altogether antagonistic to them. Babeuf was the first to openly proclaim them, in 1796; but they had surely brewed in his mind from the very beginning of this political and social effervescence. Is it possible to point out at this day the true genesis of Babeuf's ideas with which many other men were soon found to coincide? We cannot see any other explanation of it than is found in the pregnant revolutionary motto, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," which, as every one knows, became the sole object of thought and enthusiastic desire for multitudes of Frenchmen during this period of madness. The reader will be better able to judge of this after we shall have briefly commented upon it.

Liberty or freedom did not mean in this motto what it had meant for our ancestors from the beginning of the Middle Ages. Freedom was then thought to be the enjoyment of certain rights consecrated by the existing hierarchy of ranks. These were the rights of the Church and the rights of the king or ruler. There were those, too, of noblemen and of churchmen; those of burghers and of peasants; those of military men, consecrated by the rules of chivalry, and those of civil guilds and trade corporations; those of craftsmen and of students in universities, etc.

Whenever a man was not prevented from enjoying those rights he was said to have the enjoyment of his freedom. If an arbitrary

power of any kind deprived him of any of them, he was regarded as deprived of his freedom. When Magna Charta was extorted from the king in England it was merely the restoration of the rights of the Church, of the nobility, of the common people, which had been taken away or curtailed by a tyrant. But the word, liberty, was understood very differently by the French revolutionists. It was even the very reverse of all this, and became in their estimation complete emancipation from all superior powers; from those of the Church, of the king, of the nobility, of the parliament considered as a corporation, of the civil, religious, and trades' guilds, which still existed, etc. It was, in fact, under the name of liberty, the complete destruction of *freedom* as it had been defined, because the rights of all were sacrificed at once; and there remained nothing but the rabble, to which was granted supreme power, under the name of *sovereignty of the people*. But as no human society can exist without a power of some kind, *all* power was henceforth vested in the state as the executive servant of the people. This is precisely the fundamental principle of socialism, as it is now generally understood.

As to equality, the consequence of it is more glaring still, and it is especially out of this particular hobby that socialism was born. No one had ever imagined before that human society could exist without a well-determined hierarchy of ranks, and an indefinite inequality of functions. The idea of equality before the law is very different. A Christian can have no objection to it, because it is evidently founded on the most elementary principles of the Christian religion. But the new revolutionists in France gave a very different meaning to the notion of equality. According to many of them, at least, a happy social state absolutely *required* that all should have the same rights, the same degrees of enjoyment, the same quantity of property even, or an approach to it, the same means of pushing themselves in the world and reaching posts of honor; nay, the same amount of knowledge, as we will soon have an opportunity to see. This was evidently all derived from Rousseau's principles; and Rousseau's *Contrat Social* was the new gospel. All his doctrine culminated in equality, and by consequence in the suppression of superiority of any kind.

These new theorists—we mean the revolution's most ardent promoters—imagined that by obliging all men to come down to the same level, they would establish on earth a most happy social state, such as the world had never seen before. They seemed to be intimately persuaded that until their time men had been miserable only because some had been rich and others poor; some had ruled and others had obeyed; some had been honored and others unknown; some had led mankind by the loftiness of their thoughts

and others had to follow the lead of their betters. Their avowed object was to remedy the enormous evils under which mankind had grown from centuries, owing to the inequality of condition in which men are born, live, and die. Totally rejecting the Christian view, they thought that man is naturally good, was not born in sin; that he possessed in himself all the elements of happiness; that, were it not for his surroundings, namely, for the trammels of an artificial society, in which he was enslaved, he would have the means of asserting his freedom and enjoying life, unless he first entirely destroyed the universal cause of all his evils, by overturning the social edifice in which he was immured as in a dungeon, and out of which he must first emerge before he could build up the palace which his imagination had created.

It is undeniable that these dreams were openly indulged in by many Frenchmen at that time; and this alone explains the alacrity with which they abolished in a single night all the privileges of the nobility, the nobles themselves taking the lead in the strange process. All social distinctions forthwith were to disappear; all classes were to be reduced to a dead level; thenceforth no one should be able to raise his head above his fellows. Ever since that day, the importance of preserving in society as perfect a social equality as possible, has been the hobby of very many Frenchmen. By public opinion, by legislation, by every means in their power, they have endeavored to give to their nation an aspect which men have had nowhere else. They were certainly working against nature in fulfilling that hard task, for no law is so constantly and visibly active in this world as that of variety and inequality. This is evident everywhere in the universe, but it is seen pre-eminently in man's nature. For his faculties of soul and body, his aspirations and aims, even his unconscious opportunities during life, are all of them most multiform and various, and the progress of time constantly tends to increase these differences, so as to render them truly ineradicable. A large class of socialists of our day pretend that man's nature can change in that respect, by evolution; that it has already been greatly modified, and is destined to undergo modifications of far greater importance. We will come back to the consideration of this subject in another paper.

Those men, indeed, from the beginning, were so blind as not to see their folly; and particularly during the whole period of the revolution, the master spirits among them were endeavoring to bring down the entire nation to the rude state of life known as *sansculottism*, in which no individual could ever think of rising above his fellows, except as regards the bombast of his noisy *patriotism*, always with the proviso that all should be satisfied with iron and bread, *du fer et du pain*. This was especially the theory of St. Just,

the great metaphysician of the party, who can be called without injustice to his memory, one of the coolest monsters that ever existed.

But as nature always vindicates her rights, and eventually triumphs over the folly of men, many distinctions continued to exist, and many more were brought back by Bonaparte when his time came. On this very subject of equality, the two great *montagnards*, Robespierre and Marat, had not exactly the same notions. The first, although he was the bosom friend of St. Just, and though he always used the most endearing expressions when addressing the *poor* people, and commiserating their distress, invariably took good care to distinguish himself from them, at least by his dress, his habits, and his language. The second, Marat, took a sort of pride, not only in expressing pity for his dear *sansculottes*, but dressed, ate, and spoke exactly as they did. This last-named apostle of freedom was altogether consistent in his advocacy of equal rights, the other was not. It is needless to carry the description further; and it must suffice here to say that most of the features of the subsequent socialism were evidently copied from this model, and the communism which naturally followed was destined to be the complete realization of this great doctrine of equality.

Of Fraternity, the last term of the revolutionary triad, less needs be said. It may all be comprised in the remark that the great ostensible object of socialism is to establish a true brotherhood among men, and to realize consequently, the third term of the celebrated motto. Like results, however, befell this socialist *brotherhood*, which was the fate of the revolutionists' *fraternity*. It is well known that it all ended in a universal fight of factions. By a just retribution inflicted on them by Almighty God, the first idea they had as brothers, of clubbing together to trample on the rights of foreign nations, and on those of the superior classes among themselves, which they ferociously hated, terminated in a worse than fratricidal war, in which they seemed to have no other political object than literally to cut each other's throats. Our children will see, in case socialism succeeds in its plans, if its ultimate end will be very different.

Before leaving this part of our subject, it is proper to say a word on the remarkable hatred of religion during the revolutionary period, and which many socialistic systems of our day seem to have inherited from their ancestors. It is true, some pleasant eulogists of that period in France (where there are still so many admirers of the French Revolution), have thought that nearly all the principles advocated by it were Christian principles. The fact is, however, that the chief endeavor of most of its leaders, was evidently to destroy every kind of religion, even simple theism itself. God's

authority was from the beginning severely excluded from the new social organization. It was much later on that Robespierre tried to introduce his *Être Suprême*. There was no thought of it when *liberty was founded*. There was consequently no superior being on whom any one depended. Each one was his own master, even in obeying the law, because law, according to Rousseau, was only *the expression of the universal will*, and every individual's own will was included in this; every one obeyed himself in obeying the law. To this point had they carried the folly of emancipation; and it is impossible to see how there could be any religion among them. As to Catholicity, it is well known how they hated it, and what frightful and odious persecution was raised against it. We fear that nothing very different can be expected from socialism if it succeeds, and if the open shedding of blood is not so much to be feared in this century, legislative enactments will be invented and enforced strong enough to suppress every exterior manifestation of the Church's zeal, in the hope that faith itself will die in the heart when it can no longer be outwardly professed.

Babeuf was the true founder of Socialism. In proof of this it suffices to give the main points of his doctrine. There was not, perhaps, much science, as they say, in his projects. These showed, however, a deep foresight of the main difficulties the system would meet in its realization, and remarkably sound judgment in the solution of those difficulties, as far as there can be sound judgment in madness. It has always been to us a matter of wonder that modern Socialists have not, long before this, made a hero of Babeuf, of whom they never speak. He undoubtedly was the clearest and most logical utopist among them all, and died a martyr to the cause, by stabbing himself in open court, on hearing the death sentence passed upon him on account of his anti-social conspiracy.

Before he was arrested, with his chief followers, by orders from the French *Directoire*, the party published, in 1796, an *Analyse de la doctrine de Babeuf*, which spread dismay among the Parisians. A few phrases of it will give a sufficient idea of the system, which evidently contained all the germs of Socialism and Communism, at a time when no one in England or Germany had yet thought of it.

"Nature has bestowed on every man an equal right to all enjoyments. Human society can have no other object than to secure that equal right, whenever it is assailed by powerful and wicked men, and to increase the sensual gratification of each citizen by the coöperation of all in the same object. Nature imposes on all the obligations of bodily labor, and no one can shrink from it without crime. Labor and enjoyment must be common. There is oppression whenever a man must shorten his life by labor and yet suffers from want, whilst another lives in luxury without working. No one can claim for himself without crime the exclusive possession of any property either real or industrial. In a society rightfully constituted, there must be neither rich nor poor. Wealthy men who refuse to give up their superfluous property in favor of the indigent, are the people's enemies. . . . No one can use his endeavors to deprive another man of the instruction necessary for happiness: instruction must be common."

The reader will remark how Communism in all its branches was already sketched in this short programme. Enjoyment, real estate, personal property, industry, instruction, everything on which Socialistic treatises comment at length, and rave more or less in Germany, Russia or France, in our day, had been canvassed in the mind of this obscure Frenchman from Picardy, who began life as editor of the *Correspondant Picard* in Amiens, and at the end of it was not far from succeeding in overturning the *Directoire* in France, and establishing the purest Communism on the ruins of order, such as it then was.

But he was not a secondhand dreamer. All these *principles*, it is true, had been advocated by Rousseau, Malby, Condillac, and other theorists of the same school. None of them, however, knew how to give a practical turn to their theories, and to show how all this could be set on foot in a great nation. Babeuf alone among them, worked practically on the theory. Hear how Buonarotti, his most intimate friend, the second best man of the party of "Equals," as its founder named it, resumed the whole plan in a subsequent volume.

"As soon as the French people shall be declared sole proprietor of the national territory, the bodily labor of each individual citizen must become a public function regulated by law. The citizens, partitioned into various classes, will receive each one a task to perform, exactly alike for all. Each one in his turn must submit to go through whatever is less pleasant in physical labor. The social power, represented by officials needed for the purpose, will assign due limits for production all over the country, regulate the interior transportation and foreign trade, and watch over the apportionment of raw material kept in the public stores, so as to give an equal proportion of it to each citizen. The constant effort of legislation must have for its object to bring back popular manners and customs to a primitive simplicity. It was expected that very soon men would remove in great numbers from the too-populous cities created by a surfeit of civilization, distribute themselves more equally over the whole territory, and give birth in general to simple and modest villages."

With regard to public instruction and literature in general, some very curious considerations have been presented by Buonarotti in a *Summary* of the discussions which took place in Babeuf's house, between the heads of the party, when it was just being organized.

"The Committee, convinced that nothing is less important to a nation than the pruriency of shedding a false intellectual light over the world, have made up their minds not to allow the pretended votaries of science to keep aloof from the ordinary duties of citizens, and to look for happiness in another field than the common one of physical labor. They were unanimous in the intention of putting down all theological and philosophical discussions, and felt sure that the total abolition of wages and salaries, which was a part of their system, would soon cure the French from their natural inclination to shine by their wit, and even from writing books. The only knowledge necessary to the citizens, was that which enabled them to serve and defend their country. Learned bodies or corporations would never be permitted to exist. There could not be any longer either moral or intellectual pre-eminence. Genius itself could not assert its rights as against the strict equality of all men. To read, write, cipher, show a good power of reasoning, know the Republic's history and laws, be somewhat acquainted

with its topography and productions; such would be the school programme for all citizens alike. . . . Above all, the press must be strictly prevented from ever attempting to introduce anything not included in the prescribed circle of studies."

This was certainly working on a large scale, since the whole of France was included in the scheme; and one almost regrets that for the instruction of all men, Babeuf was not allowed to realize his theory. The world would have witnessed a strange sight at the expense of a foolish nation. The attempts made subsequently by the Saint-Simonians, with their priests, artists, and *industriels*, and by the Fourierites with their phalansterian system, were but childish performances compared to the universal schemes of Babeuf, could he have succeeded even for a time. It is known that some member of his newly formed party sold the whole plot to the police, and thus enabled the government to nip the bold project in the bud. Had not this taken place, it is very likely that the rash conspirator would have captured, with his well-organized legion of a few hundred desperadoes, both the legislative council and the executive itself; that he would have sent them adrift or cut off their heads, and started his theory on the way to practical realization. Then France, or rather the world, would have witnessed monstrous things. But he failed and forfeited his life, and for many years his ideas remained dormant in a few minds.

They were not dead, however, and the subversive principles detailed above, had taken too strong a hold of many minds, to remain for a very long time altogether inoperative. It was not, however, before 1830, that socialism again woke up in France. Aberlé, in the *Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique* (*Art. Socialisme*), attributes this surprising lull of the storm after its first blast, to the wars of the Republic and the Empire, which materially reduced in number the laboring classes in France, on which alone socialism could rely for success. This may have been in part the cause of this strange want of activity in the new doctrine; but a more powerful one in our opinion, was the well-ascertained fact that the *proletarians*, as Aberlé calls them, were still strongly religious in Babeuf's time, and continued to be so until after 1830. With the exception of a small number of workingmen in large cities, and of the rural classes in a radius of twenty leagues around Paris, the lower orders in France remained firmly attached to the old religion, and on this account they hailed with joy the *concordat* between Napoleon and Pius VII. The *bourgeoisie* alone, with a part of the nobility, had lost their faith; the mass of the people was sound to the core. As all the former principles of religious morality were openly set at defiance by the new social scheme, the French in a body could not yet accept it; and it is certain, in our opinion, that had Babeuf succeeded at first, his monstrous project would soon have met with



universal opposition. The reader must not lose sight of the incontrovertible fact that the first socialistic attempt, on the very face of it, embraced the destruction of all Christian principles on which society is founded, and that no aggregation of men desirous of remaining faithful to religion could for a moment entertain the idea of becoming socialists.

There is no doubt a social science which has not broken loose from Christianity, much less from natural religion, and consequently there is a Christian socialism which at this moment is strongly supported in France, particularly by men of a high degree of intellect. But of this there can be no discussion here, since we are now speaking of the time immediately subsequent to Babeuf's death, when true social science had not yet been born, except as to its principles, which are contained in the great works of the old schoolmen, of St. Thomas Aquinas in particular. It was the remaining strength of those mediæval principles which would have preserved France in 1796 from the socialistic fury, so that most of the agriculturists and workingmen would certainly have opposed Babeuf. At that time, the blatant revolutionists who had upheld the system of terror, were comparatively few in France, though they were noisy and active. Their extraordinary power for mischief was due to the strict discipline of the Jacobin society, which had spread all over France, and had enlisted everywhere a small number of active and energetic men, who carried everything before them by audacity and violence. But this Jacobin society had been utterly destroyed after Robespierre's fall, by a few thousand young men in Paris, armed only with clubs. This seems to us the true reason why there was no development whatever of Babeuf's ideas during a period of more than thirty years. France was still too much attached to the social principles which had obtained for more than ten centuries.

Hence not even the word socialism, or communism, was ever heard or written in France during the whole period of the first Empire, and the Restoration. The memory of the writer still vividly preserves the remembrance of the startling effect produced on all Frenchmen by the bold proclamation of the newly organized society of St. Simonians. At the beginning of August, 1830, directly after Charles Xth's fall, innumerable posters openly announced all over the country their projects and hopes, and called attention to their organization, their new establishments, and the books and periodicals they began to publish for the spread of their ideas. This appeared as new to all as if Babeuf had never existed.

It will not be unprofitable, however, to briefly show that this new outbreak which was to inaugurate a long era of popular conflicts and revolutions all over the world, was fatally opportune, though

unexpected. The way had been opened and smoothed for it by many events which had strongly modified human society, and prepared it for still worse changes. If any one wishes to know the "reason why" of socialism, he has only to seriously reflect on the following considerations.

The Christian religion had established on earth a well-known and sound social state, and this was eminently favorable to the poor, Christ himself having blessed the poor. Many able books have been written, clearly proving the many social advantages derived from Christianity; and a number of men of our own day, most proficient in social science, even of the *collective* school, as it is called in France and Germany (that is, in favor of vesting all property in the community or state, not in individuals; pure socialists, consequently), recognize in the people of the fourteenth century, for instance, a far greater degree of well-being than is now enjoyed by the same classes. There was then no conflict between capital and labor; in general there was a good understanding between them, and the great law of charity softened all the social asperities which now threaten to issue in open civil war. The agriculturists, with their perpetual tenure, and the workingmen in cities with their communal system, corporations and guilds, lived in much greater comfort than they ever did before or since. The convents were always present in their midst, to come to their relief in times of scarcity, sickness, or business depression. This is now admitted by all intelligent men; and it is also certain that there did not exist at that time anything like what we call the proletarian class. It is proper to assign to this its true origin and causes, in order to fully understand the origin and causes of socialism, its "reason why," and when it was invented as a universal remedy against all evils. In a single word, Protestantism began the work, and the French Revolution completed it. This has to be briefly explained.

Both did it, particularly the last, by destroying the corporations, whether religious or civil, which had been founded by Christian tenderness, charity, and consideration for the laboring classes, and leaving them to confront alone and unassisted, a cold, calculating, and crushing money-power. The Religious Corporations, or Orders in the Church, had for many centuries been most effective in protecting and aiding the poor; but the civil associations of every kind were no less productive of most beneficial results. It was the fashion, a few years ago, never to speak of these last; and if the first—the Religious Orders—were alluded to, it was often with a sneer, as if the help they afforded to the people was as degrading as that of the poor laws which have been substituted for them. At the present time a well-informed man would blush to institute such a comparison between Religious Corporations and the poor laws; the

then existing civil associations also are in general perfectly well known and appreciated. It is acknowledged that from them arose 1st, the development of modern industry ; and, 2d, the birth of the "Third Estate," as a political power. Both of them were immense factors in the social organization of Europe during the Middle Ages. Protestantism destroyed a great number of these admirable institutions ; and the French Revolution took a wild pleasure in abolishing them at one stroke, and depriving the people of all the strongest props of their prosperity, of everything, in fact, which could be a protecting power to them.

But the poor could not be destroyed, and, according to the Saviour's declaration, they must forever continue among us. Henceforth the benefactions of the convents and civil institutions were to be replaced by the poor laws ; and, deprived also of the strength they had found in the union fostered by their guilds, the people were left to the shift of agreeing individually for wages with those who had money. Thus two immense dangers to society arose, namely, pauperism, the necessary result of the poor laws, and the struggle of labor against capital, which has become one of the most prominent features of this century.

This ominous social revolution, effected gradually during the last three centuries, and intensified a hundredfold during the last one, has finally added political to social hatred by the extension of the franchise, and *necessitated* the advent of Socialism and Communism. For, as soon as the lower orders were inoculated with the spirit of indifference to religion, or of positive infidelity, no barrier was left standing against the spread of a fearful antagonism between rich and poor ; and the wildest schemes were set afloat to bring back happiness and contentment among mankind by an altogether new social doctrine. This was the origin of Socialism.

There is no denying that human society, such as Protestantism and the Revolution have made it, is groaning under the most intolerable abuses ; and under the superficial varnish of an astonishing civilization, the greatest part of mankind has strong reasons to complain that it is reduced to a state almost worse than slavery by an almost constant lowering of wages, and as constant a rising in price of the necessities of life. The most important question, however, for the laboring classes, is the pregnant one comprised in a short phrase, "Is Socialism the true remedy ?" The best way to answer it is to consider what steps have already been taken by the advocates of the new doctrine for ameliorating the condition of the poor, and to revert to the history of that doctrine.

When, in 1830, Saint-Simonism, and soon after Fourierism unveiled their secrets, Europe had received no warning of the coming crisis. The words Socialism and Communism were absolutely un-

known. The germ, however, deposited by Babeuf had not fallen into a barren soil. It had been slowly growing in the minds of a few men ; and the little club of these ardent theorists was prepared to receive any number of proselytes, to plant the tree, and foster its growth and expansion.

Comte de St. Simon had been first a soldier. He had fought under Lafayette and Washington in the American war. The French Revolution, in which he took no part, made him foolishly believe that Catholicism was dead, and must be replaced by a better religious organization. This became the dream of his whole life. For a moment, it is true, he thought of grounding all his plans on industry alone, and was on the point of coming at once to the last stage of Socialism, such as it is in our day, when it is mainly an attempt to place labor above capital. But he soon saw that some sort of moral principle was needed for the foundation of human society (a fact which modern Socialists do not perceive, in their blindness). In his bold attempt at replacing Christian principles by larger views, as he thought, he went directly to the extreme of proposing the establishment of a new religion, from which, however, all supernatural notions should be excluded, except in name. This was the origin of his system, in which mankind were to be divided into three categories, viz., priests ; artists, or *savants* ; and workmen, or *industriels*. It took the shape, therefore, of a new system of castes, in which attraction replaced equality.

He had prepared himself for his task by three years of hard study of various philosophical subjects, and afterwards by several years of travel through Europe. It is remarkable that when he came back to France, his view of England was simply that "in that country there was no new conception worth mentioning on the subject of social science." And of Germany he said that "universal science was yet in its infancy, because everything was made dependent on mystic principles." This was just before 1808. There was, therefore, no Socialism anywhere, and it is certainly in France that the doctrine has originated, since political economy had not yet deserved the name.

There is no need of entering into further details of the views of this dreamer, St. Simon, because they are now altogether forgotten. He died in 1825, fully persuaded that "the kingdom of God was coming, and that all the prophecies would soon be accomplished." His last words to his disciples were : "The fruit is ripe, you shall gather it." His friends and followers thought, in 1830, that the moment had arrived. Their antics became at once so excessive, that in 1832 the government suppressed the new society, and the French people in general applauded the decision against a sect which in their eyes was only ludicrous. That there was, however,

something very serious in it appears from the terms of the sentence pronounced against them. They were condemned to fine and imprisonment for having preached more openly even than the Jacobins the insurrection of the poor against the rich, the abolition of property, of authority, of all the rights and prerogatives of the state. They had besides set forth "that human society, as it was constituted, was either despotic or anarchical, and must be totally destroyed before a better one could be built up." Thus they were steadily walking in Babeuf's steps, but without carrying out his system of equality.

Nobody pitied the St. Simonians in France; but a few years after the suppression of their society, another suddenly loomed up, which took much deeper roots, and spread far beyond France. Fourier was its founder, and from the publication of his books dates the origin of Socialism in the United States and England, preparatory to its introduction into Germany and Russia.

Charles Fourier elaborated his system altogether independently of St. Simon, but at the very same time, since his first book, *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*, was published at Lyons under the false name of Leipsic, in 1808. No one, at first, paid any attention to his productions, which were in fact the most fanciful the world had ever seen. In 1830 he tried to coalesce with the St. Simonians, only to fall out and quarrel with them. He escaped, consequently, their fate, and in 1832 he began to receive the adhesion of several men of note; and one of them, Victor Considérant, soon attracted a great number of followers to the new system. Considérant made it more palatable to the public taste by throwing into the shade many of the founder's visionary rhapsodies. How could any one, even in France, accept Fourier's conceptions in theology, cosmogony, psychology, socialism even, and industrialism? For he embraced all these branches of science in his utopias. In theology he admitted a pretended Trinity, composed of God, matter, and mathematics or forces. His God was deprived of will, freedom, even of consciousness in a great degree. His matter was eternal and independent of God. His mathematics or forces were nothing but the laws of nature, which he pretended were eternal and self-existing. His cosmology was more ridiculous even than his theology. All the heavenly bodies—stars, comets, planets, etc.—were intelligent beings, able to produce others of the same kind by a process similar to that of animals or plants. This was owing to an aroma which each of them possessed. The earth's aroma had the fragrance of violet and jessamine, etc. The psychology of Fourier was as immoral as his theology and cosmology were absurd. It could all be reduced to the principle that the passions are everything in man, and consequently must not be opposed.

The human soul, according to him, was a fragment of the universal soul by which stars and planets are animated; the passions are simply the soul's attractions for the fulfilment of its destiny. To oppose them would be suicidal. As to the socialism and industrialism of this dreamer, they were merely the application of his psychology. This culminated in the organization of his phalansteries, which were the only part of his system acceptable to men who were not altogether deprived of their senses; and it is by developing in a more rational way the ideas of Fourier on *association* and *attraction* that his most talented disciples succeeded at last in founding some phalansteries in France and America, and presented to the world a practical socialism, which it is proper to consider more attentively.

And, first, the liberty which the new sect enjoyed everywhere of putting their ideas into practice, came from the care Fourier and his followers took not to openly discuss philosophical questions concerning property, the family, government, etc., though their principles were as destructive of human society as were those of Babeuf and St. Simon. Fourier published his first work at the time of Napoleon's greatest power, and he could not in full security have broached his crude theories, had he openly deduced their consequences. The name of Leipsic instead of Lyons on the title-page, would not even have saved him from the acute police of Fouché, had his book produced a sensation. As, however, nobody read it, this was an additional reason for not making any noise about it. Under the Restoration, Fourier and his disciples were not disquieted by the government, because they spoke only of forming associations for industrial purposes. They did not appear to walk in Babeuf's footsteps, and never pretended to form a political party with anti-social principles. This was a remarkable feature in their organization; and the new theory must be first discussed from the single point of view of industrialism, to use a new word most appropriate to the purpose, which brought back Socialism to the former discussions of political economy.

What did it amount to in Fourier's mind? To the project of opening *convents* of men and women living together, having only one object, that of production in all branches of ordinary industry, and following certain rules of their own. They are called here convents, though they were simply lay associations, and the sect never advanced any pretension to the name of a Church, as did the St. Simonian organization, because their establishments were in fact, houses of seclusion, like those of the former monks, from whom they differed chiefly by their objects, which concerned only this life and the principles of industry. Both monks and Fourierites were certainly ruled by the principles of *association* and *at-*

*traction*, but of a very different kind. The monks had a twofold object; their own eternal salvation, and that of their neighbor. Concurrently with this, their labors secured the well-being of the poor by whom they were surrounded. For these various purposes they formed strict *associations*; and there was a strong *attraction* that knit them together, derived from the threefold precept of faith, hope, and charity, included in the first commandment of the Decalogue. The grace of God was of course the chief source of this attraction, and during the many centuries of their existence, it has continued to give proofs of its strength by their rapid expansion and the great works they undertook and carried on. The Fourierites, on the contrary, had only one ostensible object; to improve the condition of the lower orders in this world by the organization of industry and labor. For this, lay associations were required, and they endeavored to found large establishments for this purpose. Each phalanstery, according to Fourier's plan, was to contain eight hundred inmates, and if the ancient monasteries were often less numerous, it frequently happened, at the beginning chiefly, that they contained several thousand persons. But the peculiarity which mainly requires our attention, is the new *attraction* invented by Fourier in order to bring harmony into the system, and secure its durability by the introduction of laws supposed to be founded on man's nature. This was nothing else than the consecration of human passions, which it was taught by Fourier were infused into all human souls at their birth, for the fulfilment of their destiny. To interfere with those passions, even with the worst of them, yea, to try to soften them, modify them, much more to subdue them, was declared to be contrary to man's nature, and to render the fulfilment of his destiny impossible. This was at once to declare that all the previous ideas of morality were wrong. Man was not inclined to evil; he had not to struggle against that inclination; and there would be a perfect harmony in human society if all the human passions had their full play. Only they must be organized, systematized, combined by groups, from which harmony would arise as it does from accords and discords in a concert. This was in fact the simile used by Fourier, who was, it seems, a great adept in music.

Many persons believed this, and from that time on, the idea began to prevail among many students of social science, that morality, virtue, and even truth, constantly changes, and that rules altogether different from those which hitherto had prevailed, must be now adopted for the good of human society, because, as they pretend, it is proved by the theory of evolution that even man's nature is perpetually subject to radical alterations. This perversion of good sense is at this moment very prevalent in a large

school of German socialists. We shall have occasion to speak of it at length in a future paper. It is sufficient here to trace its origin to Fourier's system.

Fourierism has now forever passed away, and it is needless to discuss it any longer. After a few years of sickly existence in France, England, and the United States, it died, and the impracticability of the whole scheme must be accepted by all. But it was necessary to speak of it because that system forms a link between the wild plans of Babeuf and of St. Simon on the one side, and the socialistic systems of our own day on the other, which seem to be brought back to the main notions of former economists of the Manchester school, as it is called, adding to them political aspirations and anti-social maxims, constantly growing bolder. In giving pre-eminence to the industrial element in his scheme, Fourier had struck the right key in an age which is given to production and commerce. Babeuf had scarcely spoken of it, except as a function of the state, and St. Simon had placed industrialism in the last and lowest place of his system of castes. From the time of Fourier to the present, socialism is intimately connected with the political economy of the Adam Smith school, only the principles which ought to regulate labor, capital, production, consumption, the distribution of wealth, the circulation of products, the enjoyment of the fruits of industry, etc., are altogether different from those of the first fathers of the new social science, namely, Adam Smith, John B. Say and others in England, as well as Turgot, Quesnay, Mirabeau, and the economists in France, as well as from their successors, the Manchester economists. The previous axioms are generally repudiated as favorable only to capital, and the new ones, in England and Germany, particularly, are more than ever opposed to religion, morality, and the former social principles. But this point cannot be discussed in this paper. The only thing that remains to be done is to contrast the results so far achieved by the first manifestations of socialism as we have studied it, with the state of society created by Christian ideas in previous ages. The question is a pregnant one, and we find it clearly stated in a New York paper of November 25th, 1878. "Have not the developments of society under the application of economical principles, subjected many millions of the people in European countries generally to a condition practically as bad as it was in feudal times, and for which political alleviations afford no equivalent?"

The only exception we would take to this way of stating the question, is the supposition, on the part of the writer, that the people's condition in feudal times was as bad as it is at this moment, and that there have been in our age "political alleviations" of any kind, though in the writer's opinion they do not afford an equiva-



lent. The view here taken of the social state, "in feudal times," is still considered by many as a correct one; but several authors of note in France, and also in England, have lately proved that it is all a mistake. We will not, however, here discuss this point, which has already been touched upon, though very slightly. The only matter of importance at this moment, is the actual situation of the lower classes, after all the efforts of Socialists and Economists, during a whole century, to improve their condition. We could not, if we would, describe it better than we find it stated in a short paper published in the *New York Catholic World*, of the month of November, 1878, and under the title of "Some Barriers between Labor and Capital." There is not, it is true, any discussion in it of the situation in Europe; and it is well known that the United States so far have suffered much less from Socialistic agitation than any European nation. Still, the wretched situation of the people in this country, as will be described, is due mainly to the same causes, because the industrial system of this country is only the reflex of that which prevails on the old continent, and even supposing that there was not in the United States a single man in favor of Socialism, the doings of the sect in Europe would produce here the same baneful effects, though not perhaps on so large a scale.

"What do we see in our own land, blessed by Heaven above others in the extent, variety, and fertility of her agricultural soil, her internal and external natural channels of intercourse, her marvellous mineral wealth, her wholesome climate, and her free government? Our fields have just yielded a harvest unequalled in quantity; our barns and store-houses are bursting with grain; the entire production of the country, it is estimated, will not be less than 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 1,200,000,000 bushels of corn; countless herds of cattle graze in our pastures, or are driven across our prairies; abundance so great that figures fail to give an idea of it, and that even the most moderate description of it seems an extravagance, prevails on every hand; and yet men, women and children are actually in want in the midst of this incredible plenty; beggars throng our cities, and armies of sturdy 'tramps' infest our country lanes. We build miles of new dwellings; in Philadelphia alone, a recent statement showed that there were 15,000 houses in that city without occupants; and yet thousands of men, women and children are houseless. We manufacture each year shoes enough to supply one-third of the whole human race; but there are hosts of people at our doors going barefoot. We make clothing enough to attire in decency and comfort not only our own population, but that of England and Germany besides; and yet many of our people have scarcely rags to cover their nakedness. The whirling wheels of industry and trade revolve unceasingly, production doubles, trebles, and quadruples itself; distribution is carried on with surprising facility and rapidity by a vast system of railways and steamboats; labor-saving machines decrease the cost and increase the supply of manufactured articles in a constantly-augmenting ratio; the gold and silver mines of the Pacific Slope add to the actual supply of the precious metals an annual sum of from ninety to one hundred millions of dollars; and yet not only do the poor grow more numerous and poorer, and the rich fewer and richer, but a feeling of estrangement between the two classes—a sense of bitterness, anger and oppression on one hand, and of contempt, carelessness, indifference, selfishness and pride on the other—is growing up and manifesting itself in forms that threaten the greatest disasters. *What is wrong?*"

A little further on the same writer describes the inward feelings

of discontent which begin to prevail in the United States among the *toilers* who think they are unjustly dealt with by society, and his picture is far from being exaggerated. Unable to give the whole of it, we confine ourselves to the last part of this sketch.

"If we go a little further down, and peer into the hearts of the actual hewers of wood and drawers of water—the men who dig our sewers, pave our streets, carry hods, hew stones, drive our horse-cars, labor on our docks, toil hard all day long, and sometimes all night long, for wages that barely give them and their families what are now considered by our increased and quickened wants, necessities of life—we shall find a keen and by no means a dumb spirit of discontent and unrest. The writer has talked with these men at their noonday meal, when they were eating their hard-earned dinner, with a lime-splashed plank for their seat and their table, and their bruised and begrimed hands for knives and forks; he has seen them in their poor homes, where comfort was unknown, health a miracle, and domestic privacy impossible. They feel that their lot is harder than it need be; what is the cause of it they scarcely know; but they listen earnestly to every one who proposes a remedy, however wild or chimerical. These are they who have listened so eagerly to the appeals of fools or knaves—these who, in a popular commotion, would be most easily led to the commission of acts of violence, while those who instigated them would stand aloof to see how the matter might end."

The reader knows that in Europe things have progressed still much farther than this, and that the Socialistic outbreaks in France particularly, during the republic of 1848, and, worse still, during the Commune risings of 1871, have actually threatened society with destruction; and this is the result of all the fine projects which have been set on foot during more than a century for improving the condition of the lower orders! Was not one of the fullest Socialistic programmes adopted by the government in France during the whole year 1849? The result was that a despot was required to keep the country in order, and Napoleon III. improved his opportunity and stepped upon the political stage as an emperor.

A contrast has been promised, and it is necessary to briefly state what was the people's condition in Europe centuries before the modern Social theories were advocated. The description we could make of the real comfort in which even the peasants lived, and of the abundance enjoyed by burghers and working men would, of course, be controverted by many who have not yet seen the incontrovertible proofs that might be adduced. It is impossible to give here a detailed account of them. But there is at least one point which all must admit, and this is sufficient for our purpose. No one can deny that the details just given in regard to the people's actual condition are true, and also that none of those details are applicable to the lower classes in "feudal times." At least one immense evil which has been particularly insisted upon, namely, that of a great number of men, women, and children suffering from want in the midst of plenty, was then totally unknown. If anything is proved by the chronicles of these times, it is the fact that, in mediæval

times, in years of plenty, all, poor and rich, received their proper share; and if in years of scarcity the poor suffered, the rich also had to bear their part of the burden by the curtailment, at least, of their superfluity. Thus all felt that they were treated alike, and there was not, there could not be, anything like the present estrangement of one class from the other, leading to hatred and strife. Never before was the myth of Tantalus realized in human life; for it was only in Tartarus that the guilty man was supposed to suffer from thirst in the midst of a river, and from hunger when surrounded with luscious fruits.

The remarkable difference of situation between ancient and modern times came from a principle which was formerly prevalent everywhere in Europe from the first establishment of Christianity, and which Bossuet has tersely expressed, in his *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle* (Part III., ch. 3), *La Vraie Fin de la Politique est de rendre la vie Commode et les Peuples Heureux*. This had been the doctrine of all the Fathers of the Church in regard to the state; and in speaking of a "comfortable life" and of "happy people," they excluded no class; or rather, the poor were regarded as the privileged class, and on them more than on the others was the state to bestow its care. Political economy has changed all this. Iron rules have been laid down by it respecting the production of wealth and its distribution, respecting supply and demand, etc., and if any one suffers from those rules, nobody is bound to, or even can apply a remedy, because the rules are too sacred and absolute to be touched. In presence of these rigid axioms morality itself is dumb; and J. B. Say, one of the less exaggerated among the promoters of the new science, did not hesitate to say that "the best moral lessons which can be given to a nation are those of political economy." To give a very simple and clear example of it: Every sensible man must admit that the use a man makes of his wealth comes within the province of morality, and that wealth can be applied so as to do good or to do evil, for which the doer is responsible. Xenophon, himself a Pagan, acknowledged this law when he said that "wealth is useful only to him who makes a good use of it." But the new social science, even in its most inoffensive forms, takes no account of the moral aspect of any question. It is known, too, that, in the eyes of more recent Socialists, the old rules of morality have to be entirely discarded, and the more directly and persistently one goes counter to them the better.

In Christian times this could not be, and on this account chiefly was the lot of the poor in that epoch infinitely preferable to what it is to-day; for then the moral code spoke in their favor. It is true that society was then constituted very differently from the shape it has assumed during the last three hundred years. The

same contributor to the *Catholic World*, from whom two remarkable passages have just been quoted, speaks in particular of a "law," which now operates in directions absolutely unknown in "feudal times." He calls it, "for want of a better name, the law of aggregation," and he shows that it works in nationalities as well as in individuals. The first—nationalities—are always tending to grow larger, and the second—individuals—invariably also become richer among a few, and poorer in the mass. This undoubtedly necessitates different economical laws as to the exterior working of the machine. But moral principles must rule in modern times as they did in the past, and we maintain that the existing evils come mainly from having discarded those principles which are absolutely indispensable at all times, in every form of human society, because human nature remains always the same, and moral axioms are also unchangeable.

As to the remedy the writer proposes, namely, to give to the state the full control of those immense industrial and commercial establishments which give to modern times their special character, this very important question must be left to a future paper. The remark, however, may be made, that this omnipotence of the state over industry and trade, is precisely the point on the adoption of which the German Socialists most strongly insist as the fundamental principle of their theory. They expect, no doubt, to have shortly in their hands the direction of the world, and they wish to prepare for their own advent into power a state of affairs that will leave them masters of the situation. It is not, undoubtedly, from love for M. de Bismarck that the German Socialists of the day insist so much on the principle of state omnipotence; they fondly imagine that after the great Chancellor shall have had his way during the period of his administration, their own turn will speedily arrive; and they wish to have a clear field before them. As to the supposition indulged in by the able contributor to the *Catholic World*, that things would be much better managed if the government had in its hands not only the post-office, but likewise the railroads, steamboat lines, telegraphic communication, nay, the wholesale manufacture of our shoes, clothing, household goods, besides trade in all its branches, it is indeed a dream which many recent facts and occurrences are strongly calculated to dispel from the minds of all sensible men. It is certainly preferable by far to leave in the hands of the Federal Government the carriage of our letters, and the transfer of small amounts of money by Post-office orders, than to intrust the same to private companies; although even for this there is actually in the country Express Companies, as useful in their way as the Government could be. But to deprive at once all the citizens of a great nation of the power of employing their in-

dustry and means in manufacturing and commercial transactions, would be, to say the least, extremely imprudent. Not only would the state become at once despotic, but the citizens would be directly on the way to idiocy.

The present aspect of Socialism in all its branches, will be the subject of another communication.

---

### A REVIEW OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

THE Literature of England is to us, of course, the most interesting, because it belongs as it were to ourselves—we are part of it, and can gather its wealth into the storehouses of our minds without effort and without the intervention of a medium. For there are comparatively few who can become so completely inoculated with a foreign language as to be able to appreciate the beauties of its literature as thoroughly as one to the “manor born;” and, therefore, by the majority the treasures of an alien tongue can be but indifferently comprehended through the assistance of a translation, which, if literal, must be bald, cold, and *bizarre*; while on the other hand, if an attempt is made to bring before the reader's mind the lingual beauties of the original, the result is a weakening of the idea, or the employment of words which, though beautiful and elegant, and conveying the intended meaning, yet are not the author's own, but rather, those which strike the translator as the best for his purpose.

For this reason I have chosen a ground often trodden perhaps, yet so rich in every growth of mental grandeur, beauty, and grace, as to be inexhaustible. Like the figures of a kaleidoscope, the same coloring and the same forms, yet infinite in the variety of their combinations; like a garden of flowers in which, each day, one comes upon some blossom which had escaped discovery on the previous visit, so are the labors of those mighty minds which have enriched the fields of our research.

In studying the literature of a people we read as it were between the lines, the origin and growth of that people from their first, chaotic state, through barbarism and incipient civilization, up to the full refulgence of the intellectual light of the present day. National life is not counted by years, but by centuries; and since Macaulay's *New Zealander* of the future has appropriated London Bridge, we can take *our* stand in this present age, to contemplate

the past, upon the corner-stone of Westminster Abbey, and at the bidding of memory, as at the stroke of an enchanter's wand, what a weird and motley pageant will pass before us! What development of national character, mental and moral, from epoch to epoch! In this procession let us first regard the physical condition of man; thence we can better deduce his mental status. And the difference of physical and social characteristics is as much due to climate, food, and occupation, as to light is due the proper coloring of each flower that blooms upon our upland meadows.

When the Aryan race spread itself from "India's coral strand" to "Greenland's icy mountains," those who pitched their tents beside the tideless sea, and watched their flocks amid the meads of sunny Italy, or beneath the softer skies of fair Provence, ere long grew as dreamy and indolent as the air they breathed, and since the teeming earth yielded spontaneously all luscious fruits, and cereals grew without requiring other cultivation than throwing the seed upon the ground, or other labor than the gathering of the grain, why should they slave or weary themselves? If in this second Eden all things came as it were at a wish, where was the necessity for exertion and energy?

Not so, however, those who, penetrating the frozen barriers of the Alpine range, found themselves hemmed in by ice and snow, or the alternative of water and black, oozy mud! To them it was given to do constant battle with nature in her rudest form and gloomiest aspect. The ocean was a foe to be always dreaded, watched, and provided against by those who reached its shores, and for the necessary means of preserving life by food, aside from the chase, they were obliged to coax old mother earth—what little of her they could call their own—with all the arts their limited development taught them. Can we wonder, then, if they left the forest primeval to fret the air with the moanings of its pines, and the arid soil to its crops of furze and weeds, save for the labor of their women, and betook themselves to the lives of hunters and fishers? Half-naked savages, clothed in the skins of the victims of their rude skill, and feeding upon the flesh, oftentimes raw and bloody, as it fell pierced by their arrows—such were the men, Saxons, Angles, Jutes, Frisians, and Danes, who, from the fifth to the ninth century, made England their battle-ground, and laid the foundation of her present empire.

The period of the first settlement of the island is lost in the depths of the earliest ages. All that can be gathered of the Celts prove them to be members of the great Aryan family, but when or how they crossed the sea is unknown. As they were hunters and fishers and swineherds before, so they failed to find in the new country any suggestions for a higher mode of life; it was a wild

and foggy land—what could these rude savages do to better it? Befogged in their intellectual development, how could they disperse the mists around them?

Poetry, art, love, and all the refinements of the times were for the vine-clad hills that swept down to the fair Southern sea, whose waves laved the shores with a soft and soothing rhythm. To the barbarian, gazing from his mud-hovel into the cloud-laden sky, who heard but the drip, drip, dripping of the rain all day upon the oaks and beeches, what message of peace and joyousness could the beating of the surging waves upon the rocks bring to him? What philosophy could recommend itself to his darkened mind? What system of ethics would he judge best to follow?

History tells us that about fifty years before our Saviour's birth the Romans invaded Britain, and found it governed or controlled for the most part by the priests or Druids. These men were wise above their fellows, and were possessed of some learning, and had established a curious and methodical system of teaching—by verse—a system at once advantageous in an age when writing was not a popular accomplishment—and pleasing, since it assisted the memory and captivated the fancy. They gave public instruction in the persuasive science of rhetoric, and by its varied agency and irresistible enchantment their fiercest passions could be soothed during peace, and stimulated and inflamed at the hour of peril. They had caught also a faint echo from the Greek colony at Marseilles. All this mental cultivation was destroyed by the Romans. During the next hundred years repeated inroads from the all-conquering eagles kept the country in a distracted state, but it was not till the fortieth year of the Christian era that the regular conquest of the island was begun by the Emperor Claudius. Some nameless follower of the Son of the Carpenter must have found his way, possibly in the army of the invader, to these distant shores, and planted the seed of the new doctrines upon them, for there were Christians here before the Romans took complete possession. Tradition tells that St. Paul himself preached the Gospel here between his first and second imprisonment in Rome.

A natural aversion towards their conquerors was at first difficult to be overcome in the islanders; but this dislike yielded gradually to the study of the new and polished language, the elegant models of composition and thought in which their literature abounded; and so it came to pass that the conquered people at last received the learning of the conquerors with wondering interest, and the Greek and Latin tongues became the vehicle of instruction, and prepared them in some degree for fully receiving the humanizing influence of the Christian dispensation; a dispensation which, whether accepted or rejected, would awaken the spirit of research

and stimulate their reason and intellectual energies. The philosophical principles of Aristotle and Cicero plainly and clearly guided their efforts. They learned to have a definite object of inquiry and to pursue it methodically. But with this cultivation had also been instilled the enervating influence of its false philosophy; and thus it was that, the presence of the conquerors removed, the next invaders found the islanders a spiritless and easy prey.

Yet there were great names to stud the age like stars of the first magnitude in a moonless sky. Great, I mean, in another than the usual interpretation, such as St. Ninian, St. Patrick, Pelagius, and Celestius. The learned Bishop Dubricius had established two seminaries on the river Rye. Most of the educated Britons withdrew to the peaceful retirement of other lands when the fierce Vikings swooped down upon the country from the frozen North. Only a few remained to nurse the feeble spark of learning, and at the head of these we must place Gildas, the historian.

The Saxons were restless marauders, whose virtues, if they possessed any, had never been mellowed by the operation of science or the softer influence of the true religion; therefore they brought back confusion and intellectual obscurity in their train.

For as the life, so was the man. Exposure to wind and wave, following the animals of the chase over hill and through dale, he became a very son of Anak. Huge in body, cold in blood, with reddish flaxen hair and blue eyes; hearty eater and deep drinker, cold in temperament and slow to love—such in physical and mental development was the barbarian, the Saxon, to whom we owe the substratum of our intellectual existence. Every page of the old Sagas show us how they loved war and carnage, how obstinate and furious they were; their bravery but the unchaining of the butcher's instincts. As a sample of the table-talk of the day we read how the daughter of a Danish Jarl, seeing one of their heroes take his seat near her, repels him scornfully, telling him that he has failed to provide the wolves with hot meat, and that he has not seen for months the ravens croaking over carnage. In reply to this maidenly and gentle taunt, first seizing hold of her, he sings that he has marched with his "bloody sword and the raven has followed." "Furiously we fought and the fire passed over the dwellings of men; we slept in the blood of those who kept the gates." Let us hope that a devoir so glorious satisfied the soft-hearted girl, and that her lover was forgiven.

Grown wealthier in England we find the same natures grown worse, having passed from brutal action to brutal enjoyment. Stimulated by deep draughts of mead, ale, and spiced wines, and all the strong, coarse drinks they can procure, filling themselves with flesh, they resemble more the beasts they tend than human



beings ; clumsy and absurd, when not dangerous because enraged. Shouting and capering about and revelling in the riot of the wildest orgies was the first need of the savage. "The human brute," says Taine, "gluts himself with sensation and noise." If, even in our day, beneath the elaborate crust of refinement and cultivation which our natures have accumulated in all these years, the volcanic fires of the ancestral barbarian spirit breaks forth at times, how must they have raged in those far-off ages when nature, debased and degraded, had it all her own wild way.

A century and a half after the Saxon invasion missionaries from Rome came and straightway made converts. Yet it was difficult, and only a God-inspired religion could succeed. The milder influences of Christianity could only affect and overcome Saxon grossness by virtue of its inherent divine power, and the barbarian converted was, in many cases, a barbarian still; and so, to a certain extent, was his son. In the ballads and legends of these times there is but one revolting theme, a monograph of war and blood, revenge and rapine. Still, withal, there were noble dispositions, and out of the chaos a nobler people were to arise. With the Christian dispensation there was something like scholastic discipline developed, and we have the venerable Bede, Alcuin, John Scotus Erigena, and others, commentators and translators, compiling out of the Greek and Latin something to suit the new nation.

The remains of the Roman settlers were reduced to slavery where they were not exterminated; for while on the continent the Germans of Gaul, Italy, and Spain became Roman to a certain extent, the Germans of England remained Germans still in language, in manners, and in thought. Seagirt as their land was isolated from danger of chance predatory incursions from near neighbors whom some petty spite might at any time change from friend to foe, they naturally turned their attention inward to themselves and their own best interests. The bonds which united them had a substratum of generous sentiment. They were independent and brave to a violent excess, but these very excesses were the extreme, unrestrained outcome of noble qualities, and promised a grand future for the young nation. They became simple and strong, faithful to their families and to their chiefs, firm and steadfast in friendship, courageous, and self-sacrificing. Every clan was a band of brothers ready each to do battle for the other, and above all for their leader. The songs and stories all turn on this feudal faithfulness. Gradually, too, we find the state of woman is elevated and respected. She is no longer a chattel. She can inherit, hold, and bequeath property, and takes henceforth her proper place in society as man's helpmeet and companion. Of the poetry of this age there are but few fragments left, yet from these we can easily judge of the strange and

powerful poetic genius of the race. But the Danes crushed all this budding culture and civilization, and when Alfred had succeeded in repelling them he had all the fair structure to rebuild.

The brilliant reign of this king, so famed in song and story, soon dispelled the clouds of ignorance and error which had overspread the literary horizon. He invited the most celebrated scholars from foreign climes, and compelled his own subjects to allow their children to benefit by the advantages thus placed within their reach. He liberally rewarded proficiency in scientific accomplishments, and the more wealthy of his court soon learned to conciliate his favor by facilitating the advancement of education, and liberally rewarding its professors. Nor was his own pen idle while he encouraged those of others. Down through the cycles of the ages he has shone upon us with a marvellous lustre. Excelling in all kingly and knightly attributes of martial prowess, nobility of thought and generosity of deed, he united to those qualifications a mental culture rare in those barbarous days. He spoke Latin with the fluent grace of a Roman, and cultivated Greek literature with success, while to his reputation as an orator, philosopher, and historian, the fame of wooing with good fortune the Saxon muse may also be added. Domestic economy, if we believe the fable, was the one weak point in his armor. He didn't know enough about cooking to turn the oaten cakes when they were done!

The foundation and endowment of the University of Oxford was the crowning glory of his reign. Muratori thus speaks of this glorious age: "Nor should praise be withheld from Britain, Scotland, and Ireland, which at this time, in the career of letters, surpassed the other realms of the West, and that chiefly by the labor of the monks, who, while learning elsewhere lay languid and depressed, vigorously encouraged and upheld its cause. That in Gaul the pursuits of science were revived and schools opened, was owing to the Saxon Alcuin, and Italy confessed her obligations to him and his countrymen."

But when the great magician passed from the scene, all was confusion again. The Danes renewed their ravages, no longer held back by the terror of his arms, and his successor, Edward, was too weak to withstand them. To this prince, however, we owe the foundation of the University of Cambridge, in this act emulating his revered father. Athelstane and Edgar did what they could to prevent the decline and encourage the advancement of learning, but at the death of the latter England once more became the victim of her Danish persecutors, who razed the infant institutions of Oxford and Cambridge to the ground. When, however, the Danes had established their supremacy, and the Saxons were quietly submis-

sive to their yoke, the aspect of affairs assumed a more favorable appearance. Canute re-established the University of Oxford, and repaired, as far as in him lay, the devastations of his countrymen, but Harold showed no desire to follow in his father's footsteps, and he undid much that had been accomplished.

With the year 1041 came Edward the Confessor, to whom we are indebted for the corner-stone from which we have taken this cursory view of the origin of English literature. This king found his subjects too restless and irritable to pay much or effectual attention to literary labor, but he used his best efforts to atone and make compensation for the flagrant atrocities of his predecessors. His work was continued by his successor, the hapless Harold, who, after a short reign, lost his life and crown upon the fatal field of Hastings, and with him terminated the Anglo-Saxon dynasty.

Up to this period of our history, and indeed for some time after, a distinct prose literature of a national character could hardly be said to exist. The popular ballads and metrical romances were embodied in their native Saxon, deficient neither in dignity nor in harmonious sweetness, but the graver learning of the times was commonly transmitted to posterity in the more classic Latin. Still, sufficient was done in constructing and cultivating the language to supply the substantial groundwork of our modern English, which is under many obligations to its venerable predecessor for much of its expressiveness and power. After the Norman conquest the new king discouraged the use of the Saxon tongue as much as possible, yet the power and strength of that tongue were shown at the end of three centuries, when it still preponderated in the language, as the Saxon character, sturdy and bold, preponderated in the nation. Three hundred years pass away after the Norman conquest, and the conquerors were conquered—their speech becomes English and the race remains Saxon.

We must take a glance backward at the new invaders. These last conquerors of the fair English isle were, like the conquered, of Germanic origin. They, too, led a roving life among the stormy, barren hills of the northern peninsula, and varied it by voyages among the icy seas of the same latitude. A band of them, driven by storm past the English shores, were thrown upon those of Neustria, and, attracted by these fertile plains, settled there, marrying the women of the country. They were not a purely Scandinavian company. In their wanderings they had collected recruits from all classes; and knaves and desperadoes were reckoned among them from other tribes, so the settled band was a very mongrel one. Rollo, the leader, having divided the country among his followers and hung the thieves and their friends, invited, say the old writers, many strangers, and "made one people out of so many folks of different

natures." This mixed set spoke French very readily, and so quickly was their native Danish forgotten that the second duke, wishing to have his son learn that language, was obliged to send him to the school at Bayeux! So transformed, the people soon became polished, and displayed a quick wit and ready genius. They were far keener, and, if we may use a modern Americanism to express what we mean, far *smarter* than the Saxons over yonder, across the Channel.

"The Saxons," says William of Malmesbury, "vied with each other in their drinking feats, and wasted their goods by day and by night in revels, while they lived in wretched hovels. The French and Normans, on the other hand, lived inexpensively in their fine large houses; were besides studiously refined in their food and careful in their habits. The former, still weighted by the German phlegm, were gluttons and drunkards, now and then roused by poetical enthusiasm; the latter, made sprightlier by their transplantation and their alloy, felt the cravings of genius already making themselves manifest." "You might see among them churches in every village and monasteries in the cities towering on high, and built in a style unknown before." Taste seemed to spring up spontaneously in their nature, the wish to give pleasure by the outward representation of thought, and so their peculiar architecture developed itself.

And just as naturally and quickly came the spirit of inquiry. "Nations are like children," says Taine; "with some the tongue is loosened with difficulty and they are slow of comprehension. The men before us had educated themselves nimbly, as Frenchmen do. They were the first in France to unravel the language, fixing it and writing it so well that to this day we understand their code and their poems. In a century and a half they were so far cultivated as to find the Saxons unlettered and rude." That was the excuse they made for banishing them from the abbeys and all valuable ecclesiastical posts.

The year 1066 is memorable as that of the Norman conquest of England. On Michaelmas day, William, Duke of Normandy, landed at Pevensey. The superstitious among his followers might have been disheartened at the outset by an unfortunate incident, had not the ready wit of the conqueror turned it to good account. On springing ashore his foot slipped, and he measured his unusual length full upon the sand. Grasping both hands full he sprang up exclaiming, "By the splendor of God! I have seized England with my two hands!" and a Norman soldier, seeing as quickly the point of the situation, snatching a thatch from the nearest hut said, as he presented it to the duke, "Sire, receive the seizin; the country is yours!" Sixteen days after came the battle of Senlac or Hastings, in which Harold and his brothers, the brave sons of Earl Godwin were killed. Bulwer, in his "Last of the Barons," has given a thrill-

ing but truthful account of this final struggle of brute courage and strength against finesse and a courage superior only because well drilled and disciplined.

In this age only two classes of men cultivated literature, the clergy and the minstrels; but for many years after the conquest the Saxon clergy were in no mood or condition to betake themselves to the tranquil pursuits of learning. Religious fervor had for a time relaxed, and William found that many abuses had grown up. His appointment of Lanfranc to the See of Canterbury inaugurated a great reform in church matters. There were but few Saxon bishops retained; among them, however, were such names as St. Wulstan of Worcester, Agelric of Chichester, and one or two others. Laws were passed forbidding a Saxon monk or priest to aspire to any dignity. Saxon monks in the monastery of Peterborough, however, kept up the knowledge of the Saxon tongue in the *Saxon Chronicle*, a work which they continued to publish until the last year of the reign of Henry II., when it ends abruptly. Anglo-Saxon was no longer taught in the schools, and lost much of its original harmony and precision of structure.

While the cases of England, conquered by the Normans in the eleventh century, and of Italy, overrun by the Goths in the fifth, are widely different, yet some similitude may be found, and the final result both to the language and the literature of the conquered people was pretty much the same. The Gothic barbarism was at first destructive only; it was not until several hundred years had passed that it proved itself anything else. But the Normans were already civilized and glowing with the first beauty of their civilization. In both cases the result was a combination both in language and literature, but the Gothic preponderated in England, while the Latin remained the stronger element in Italy, France, and Spain. And the English language possesses the remarkable distinction of being the only one of Europe which is Gothic in its skeleton and classic only in what is non-essential. The others are either without the classic element entirely, as with the Scandinavians and Germans, or else it preponderates and governs, as in the Spanish, French, and Italian. This English tongue, by reason of its inherent strength and beauty, is a very powerful factor in the civilization of the world, as England by her peculiar position is in the political arena. The English are the greatest colonizing people in the world, it being, as Coleridge says, the natural destiny of the country, as an island, to be the mother of nations.

Heartburnings and all the bitterness of hopeless subjection to a stronger force rendered the Saxon of the next two generations, after Harold fell at Senlac, far from happy; and the discontent of the conquerors at the stubborn opposition of the people, and the cold and dampness of the climate, so different from their own sunny

land, induced a state of society by no means admirable or desirable. As we have already noticed, the efforts of the conquerors were all directed to "stamping out" the conquered—language, literature, and, if possible, race—with what result the England of to-day shows. But their efforts were none the less energetic that they were unsuccessful; and when we consider the lawlessness of the times, the overwhelming power in their hands, and the energy with which they used it, their non-success is a subject of wonder. On the other hand the conquered opposed a sullen *vis inertia* and a determination to preserve their beloved language and habits at all hazards, notwithstanding that they were obliged to conform in public to Norman law and Norman tongue.

But notwithstanding the misery and suffering of the transition state, the conquest was in the end a benefit. It made England a part of the continent, drew her into social and political relations with the nations of which heretofore she had known little and cared less. And as a necessity in her new relations she shared in some degree in the changes and advancement of literature and language. In France, the learning that flourished in the age of Charlemagne had not undergone decay to the extent to which that of England had fallen off since the days of Alfred; but in the tenth century a new element was introduced—a learning peculiar to the East, which obtained through the Arabs in Spain. In that era Arabic Spain was the fountain-head of learning in Europe. Thither students from all parts flocked, and teachers in France and Italy finished their course in her seminaries. None of this peculiar culture had found its way into England before the Norman conquest, but it followed as a matter of course. William, notwithstanding his repression of, and efforts to destroy, all that was left of Saxon learning, as well as the Saxon people themselves, proved himself in his own way a munificent patron of learning. Having spent much of his early life at the French court, he had imbibed an appreciation of the advantages of study, and while unable, owing to the stormy era when eternal vigilance was the price of life and crown, to devote his own time to letters, he was careful to have his children not only well educated, but imbued with a love of learning which showed itself in the careful intellectual training they, in their turn, bestowed upon their children. Yet, as a general thing, learning of a higher order was confined to the clergy in these days. The tiller of the soil found no time for study, even supposing that he possessed the means. The noble of the day was solely devoted to his military duties, and his only relaxation was the chase. So it came to pass that the learned portion of the community were set aside, a sort of aristocracy of letters, from their contemporaries, and looked down upon them from their bookish height with sovereign con-

tempt. Schools and seminaries of learning were greatly multiplied, and were of a high tone and character. Archbishop Lanfranc and his successor, Anselm, exerted themselves with great zeal to this end, and the Church, ever vigilant from its watchtower upon the seven hills, seconded their efforts. In 1179 it was decreed by the Third General Council of Lateran that every cathedral should appoint and maintain a head teacher or Scholastic, as was the title given him, who, besides teaching a school of his own, should have authority over all the other schools in the diocese. And besides these there were others established in Religious Houses of which, from the conquest to the end of the reign of John, no less than five hundred and fifty-seven were founded, besides many which had been founded in earlier times. There were also established city and village schools. Of these, one for law and medicine in the town of St. Albans was presided over by Matthew, a physician educated at the famous school of Salerno in Italy. There were three of these schools in London in the time of Henry II.

The twelfth century is memorable for the institution of universities—that of Paris taking the lead. During the reign of Richard I. Oxford was organized as a university, a rival to Paris. The latter was the Alma Mater of most of the most distinguished of the learned of every country. Abelard was a teacher and Thomas à'Becket a student; also Robert of Melun and Robert White. The former disputed with the Nominalists and lectured on theology and philosophy, and was made Bishop of Hereford; the latter lectured on theology at Oxford for five years, declined a mitre offered him by Henry I., and afterwards, at the invitation of Celestine II., went to Rome, and was made Cardinal and Chancellor of the Holy See. John of Salisbury was also a student at Paris, and so, too, was another famous Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, afterwards Pope Adrian IV.

There is no space here to go into the merits of the different schools of philosophy; men were free then as now to start and support whatever theory they pleased, so that they did not encroach upon the sacred domain of divine truth taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, and guarded jealously by their successors in the Church. Poets there were who wrote out their inspirations and sung or recited them before their patrons, and, perhaps, presented a carefully prepared copy to some fair friend or rich enthusiast; all the fiction of the age was confined to this form, and owing to its perishable nature little has been handed down to us. Books there were, but these were few and of high price, for they represented the exhausting manual labor of years, mostly by the monks, though occasionally a layman was found patient enough to undertake the task. The numerous monasteries had each a library, and it passed into a proverb that a monastery without a library was

like a castle without an armory. "In every great abbey," says Warton, "there was an apartment called the scriptorium, where many writers were constantly busied in transcribing, not only the service-books for the choir, but books for the library." The scriptorium of St. Albans was built by Abbot Paulin, a Norman, who about the year 1080, ordered many volumes to be written there. Lanfranc furnished the copies. Estates were often granted for the support of the scriptorium. Some of the classics were written in the English monasteries very early. Henry, a Benedictine monk of Hyde Abbey, near Winchester, transcribed in the year 1178 Terence, Boethius, Suetonius, and Claudian. Of these he formed one book, illuminating the initials and forming the brazen bosses of the covers with his own hands. The scarcity of parchment undoubtedly prevented the transcription of many other books in these societies. About 1120, one Master Hugh being appointed by the Convent of St. Edmundsbury, in Suffolk, to write and illuminate a grand copy of the Bible for the library, could procure no parchment in England. Paper made from cotton rags was in common use in the twelfth century, though it was not until one hundred years later that that made from linen was known.

From the Norman conquest, for three hundred years the process of amalgamation and subsidence went on in the English nation, and as a matter of course literature and learning, in spite of the efforts of scholastics, suffered. In all that time no name stands out in bold relief, although there were not wanting those who shone as brilliant stars in the galaxy, such as Hales, Bacon, Duns Scotus, Occam, Grosstête, and Scott (the wizard of song and story, but not the great unknown), and many others. And in these struggles the language underwent changes also. The educated preferred to speak Latin; the Saxon hind clung to his native tongue; and the conquerors to theirs. The hatred of the conquered and the contempt of the conquerors kept each to his own as a matter of pride, and this feeling is finely illustrated in Scott's *Ivanhoe*. The Latin was the language of the Church and of the law, and gradually, like the alkali betwixt oil and water, effected a union which has resulted in the *English* of to-day.

I think one specimen of the literary efforts of those times will suffice. We have the hymn of St. Godric:

"Sainte Marie (clane) virgine,  
Moder Jhesu Cristes Nazarene,  
On for [*or* fong] schild, help thin Godric,  
On fang bring hegilich with the in Godes riche,  
Sainte Marie, Christe's bur  
Maidens clenhad, moderers flur,  
Dilie min sinne [*or* sennen], rix in min mod,  
Bring me to winne with the selfd God."



Which, translated by means of the Latin version, is found to mean: "St. Mary (chaste) virgin, mother of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, take, shield, help thy Godric; take, bring him quickly with thee into God's kingdom. St. Mary, Christ's chamber, purity of a maiden, flower of a mother, destroy my sin, reign in my mind, bring me to dwell with the only God." Craik and Arnold give us several specimens of the same style, but I think one will suffice.

The English Metrical Romance dates from the thirteenth century. The most noted authors were Robert of Gloucester, Robert de Brienne, Lawrence Minot, and John Langman. The latter was the author of *Piers the Ploughman*, which is the earliest work that can be read with anything like pleasure or ease as far as the language is concerned; the others were only translators or paraphrasts. This form of romance took great hold upon the community, and was much read up to the sixteenth century. From that time this earliest form of our poetical literature slumbered until revived by Sir Walter Scott.

But the first great poet, the true father of our literature, was Geoffrey Chaucer; compared with him all the rest was barbarism. As Homer was to Greece, as Dante to Italy, so was he to England, and our living English literature begins with his poetry. Chaucer was born in 1328. He struck a new key in the symphony of letters, and as he approaches us in the long procession, we see before him only a confusion and struggle in which nothing strikes the eye or ear but the wrangling of hypercritics. He devoted himself to the purifying of his native tongue, and to his labors more than to any of his followers are we indebted for the strong terse vehicle of communication in use among us to-day. He was accustomed to hearing only French and Latin spoken by his schoolfellows and teachers, and as a boy the desire was borne in upon him to redeem the language he had heard spoken around his home fireside, from the degradation in which it had lain so long. Yet, after all, it was not until the reign of Elizabeth that the nation awoke to a true appreciation of what Chaucer had done. The poetic form or rhyme had long been in use before Chaucer's time, so that he had but to imitate his predecessors; yet the particular species of verse in which he wrote his *Canterbury Tales* and some of his other poems had never been employed before, nor has any change or improvement been made in the construction of English verse since he wrote. On the contrary he is regarded by poets as the great reformer of our language and our poetry, and as their master instructor in their common art. In his notes on the Prologue to *Canterbury Tales*, Tyrwhitt remarks: "His poetry exhibits in as remarkable a degree perhaps as any other in any lan-

guage, an intermixture and combination of what are usually deemed the most opposite excellences. Great poet as he is, we might almost say of him that his genius has as much about it of the spirit of prose as of poetry, and that, if he had not sung so admirably as he has done, of flowery meadows and summer skies, and gorgeous ceremonials, and high or tender passions, and the other themes over which the imagination loves best to pour her vivifying light, he would have won to himself the renown of a Montaigne or a Swift, by the originality and penetrating sagacity of his observations on ordinary life, his insight into motives and character, the richness and peculiarity of his humor, the sharp edge of his satire, and the propriety, flexibility, and exquisite expressiveness of his refined yet natural diction. Even like the varied visible creation around us, his poetry has its earth, its sea, and its sky, and all the sweet vicissitudes of each. Here you have the clear-eyed observer of man as he is, catching 'the manners living as they rise,' and fixing them in pictures where not their minutest lineament is or ever can be lost; here he is the inspired dreamer, by whom earth and all its realities are forgotten as his spirit soars and sings in the finer air and amid the diviner beauty of some far-off world of its own. Now the riotous verse rings loud with the turbulence of human merriment and laughter, casting from it, as it dashes on its way, flash after flash of all the forms of wit and comedy; now it is the tranquillizing companionship of the sights and sounds of inanimate nature, of which the poet's heart is full—the springing herbage and the dew-drops on the leaf, and the runlets glad beneath the morning ray and dancing to their own simple music. From mere narrative and playful humor up to the height of imaginative and impassioned song, his genius has exercised itself in all styles of poetry and won imperishable laurels in all." The length of the extract will be pardoned for its own intrinsic beauty and for the subject.

For a century before Chaucer's time writers had been busy translating French romances into English, which was with a singular reaction fast becoming the ordinary or only speech of the educated classes (the three hundred years since the conquest had passed); but this work had for the most part been done with little care, the effort being simply to convey the mere sense of the French original to the English reader. By Chaucer's time the French language had gone almost out of use, and the English had thrown off much of its primitive rudeness, and acquired a considerable degree of regularity and flexibility and general fitness for literary composition. The two languages had, like the two nations, become completely separated and in some sort hostile, as the kings of England were no longer Dukes of Normandy or Earls of Poitou, and

recently a fierce war had broken all intercourse of a friendly nature. But Chaucer was far from perfect; he was sometimes vulgar and not seldom obscene, yet much must be forgiven when we consider the manners and customs of the age in which he wrote and the difficulties which he had to overcome.

The latter part of the fourteenth century was the date of the birth of Scottish poetry, and Chaucer had a rival in John Barbour. He is the author of a metrical biography in twenty books commemorative of the great hero of Scotland, the Bruce. His style possessed a finish which Chaucer himself has scarcely equalled; his versification is rendered conspicuous by its eminent fluency and correctness, and an elevation of sentiment gives a modern leaven to his song which one is scarcely prepared for so early. Barbour was Archdeacon of Aberdeen, and we will quote the sturdy priest's tribute to liberty:

" Ah! freedom is a noble thing!  
Freedom makes men to have liking!  
Freedom all solace to man gives!  
He lives at ease, that freely lives!  
A noble heart may have none ease,  
Na illys might that may him please,  
If freedom fail; for free liking  
Is yearned o'er all other thing,  
Na he that aye has livid free  
May not know well the propertie  
The anger, na the wretched doom  
That is compelled to foul thralldom."

Nor must we pass over Sir John Mandeville, who has so strong claims upon our gratitude. But after him comes a long night of darkness, during the reigns of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Henrys, while the rest of Europe was still struggling onward. England was a battle-ground first for the efforts of Henry of Lancaster to wrest the crown from his feeble cousin, the 2d Richard, the last of the Plantagenets; then while the 5th Henry was seeking "the bubble reputation" at Agincourt and Poitiers, the Scots invaded his own kingdom, and the country, drained for a war of aggression in one direction, was obliged to meet this second foe in one of defence. Last of his dynasty, Henry VI. and his lion-hearted queen fought the losing battles of the Roses, and in all these years there was little time for study. Brother was arrayed against brother; the peaceable and studious were forced into action; and oftentimes the hands consecrated to the pure service of religion were defiled by the weapons and carnage of war. Erudition and science were generally treated, as it may be easily imagined, with almost total inattention and contempt, and wellnigh stifled amid the contentions and the distracting fury of civil discord. The few literary monu-

ments of the age are sadly disfigured by vulgarity and by tasteless extravagance.

Again we find the monks coming to the rescue of the literary world. As long as the Church was free letters could not perish. Lydgate, a monk of Bury, with his friend Occleve, saved English heroic verse. They introduced a more copious and perspicuous diction, and added judiciously to the vigor and the harmony of our language.

In justice to the age mention must be made of the colleges endowed in Oxford and Cambridge, and the Universities of St. Andrews and of Glasgow. The reign of Henry V. was the first also in our annals in which letter-writing became fashionable and common in the English language. Of this form of literary composition the Paston Collection is a most instructive and curious miscellany, extending over three reigns, revealing at once obscure questions of state policy, and elucidating most distinctly the private manners of the age. The style is simple and easy, and shows that the laity had not neglected the means afforded them of improvement, and that mental culture was finding its way to the camp as well as to the court and grove.

From the accession of Edward IV. to the death of Henry VII. affairs were more encouraging. The Earl of Worcester, Sir John Fortescue, Earl Rivers, and others lent the splendor of their rank and the encouragement of their example to assist the reviving activity of letters; and as Walpole truly says: "The countenance of men in their situation must have operated more strongly than the attempts of a hundred professors, and commentators." But the literature of this crisis lies under much deeper obligations to an humble citizen of London than to the patronage of the high-born and wealthy; William Caxton, mercer, was the first to introduce printing into England, thirty years after it had been discovered by Faust and Guttenberg, or Laurens Coster, as the case may be.

The reign of Henry VIII. was the commencement of what has been properly styled the modern history of our country. Henry was himself well versed in all the learning of the times, and prided himself upon his knowledge. His wife, that "pearl which had hung around his neck for twenty years and never dimmed her lustre,"<sup>1</sup> was his equal in all intellectual acquirements. She had been most carefully reared by her mother, Isabella of Castile, and possessed all that mother's charms of mind, and all the dark glowing beauty of her native land. England's was indeed a golden

---

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare.

age until the demon of lust and all iniquity tempted Henry from Annie Boleyn's eyes. One of the grandest names which adorn this troublous time is that of Sir Thomas More.

As the "northern lights" upon a dark night, so upon the darkness of this era beamed the brilliant talents of James of Scotland, the first of the hapless Stuart line; that line which, as long as it remained firmly attached to the true Church was the model of all kingly and knightly virtues, manliness and beauty of character, and brilliancy of intellect. From the first to the fifth James, and ending with the tragic fate of Mary, of whom her latest apologist speaks so beautifully when he says: "The truth is, Mary's unvarying queenly dignity and womanly gentleness, in all she speaks and writes, is a source of profound unhappiness to her English historian" (Froude),<sup>1</sup> the family had nothing to blush for. Their human faults and frailties were amply atoned for by their superb endowments. After the tragedy of Fotheringay their star of fortune and of fame set; henceforth they are to be pitied if not despised. All the works of the royal author are full of nature and the rich coloring of genius, instinct with the resistless witchery of consummate tenderness and fancy.

The fact most deserving of remark in the progress of English literature, for the first half of the sixteenth century, is the cultivation of the language in prose literature, a form always subsequent to that of verse in the natural development of language and literature. Long before this, Chaucer, in addition to what he did in his own proper field, had given proof of how far his genius outstripped his age by several examples of composition in prose, in which may be found something of the high art with which he first elevated our poetry; but in his day the language was not yet fitted for prose, and Chaucer had no worthy successor either in prose or verse till more than a century after his death.

Meanwhile, however, the language, though not receiving much artificial cultivation, was undergoing a good deal of what, in a certain sense, might be called application to literary purposes by its employment both in public proceedings and documents, and also in many popular writings by persons of some pretensions at least to scholarship, if not bringing much artistic feeling and skill to the task of composition. It must, as a mere language or system of vocables and grammatical forms, have not only sustained many changes and modifications, but acquired considerable enlargement of its capacities and powers, and been carried forward generally towards maturity under the impulse of a vigorous principle of growth and expansion. But it is not till after the beginning of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Meline's Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest historian.

sixteenth century that we date the use of our classical prose literature. Perhaps the earliest composition to be called so is More's life of Edward V. Most of More's other works are controversial, and are written in a style of great power and strength. Sir Thomas Elyot may be classed with More as one of the earliest writers of English classic prose. He was the author of a political treatise entitled *The Governor*, and of various other works, one a Latin and English dictionary, the foundation of all such compilations for a century after. At this time we have many translations of the Bible, and many treatises by the Reformers *soi disant*, in which, with more or less of elegance and eloquence, they strove to make the worse appear the better cause. In spite of all assertions to the contrary, to which nothing tangible can be offered as proof, the "Reformation" was a great blow, not only to morals and manners, but, as a natural corollary, to the true progress of literature. All that the labor of centuries had achieved could not be lost, but for long, long years nothing was gained. The new doctrines had their apologists and defenders by the pen as well as by the sword, but the intolerant persecution of the Church and of those who still clung to her naturally retarded progress, and the necessity of proving error to be truth required the destruction or perversion of much which could never be recovered or set right. The much-boasted enfranchisement of men's intellect from clerical inthralment was but a throwing off of the restraint upon men's passions imposed by the Almighty Creator; and as a consequence the so-called liberty soon degenerated into a license and lawlessness which the strong arm of the state was at times powerless to curb. It was only when the common sense of the majority recognized the unpalatable fact that they had let loose a spirit, the strength and tendency of which they had little idea of, that they were driven to enact in other forms the very same restrictions they had so loudly proclaimed tyrannical. In other words, they were obliged to clothe in the dress of human legislation the inherent truths of God's law, that order was to outward seeming restored.

But we have anticipated. Generally, it is to be observed of the English prose of the earlier part of the sixteenth century, that it is more simple in its construction and of a more purely native character in other respects than the style which came into fashion in the latter years of the Elizabethan period. When first made use of in prose composition the mother tongue was written as it was spoken; even the embellishments naturally used in verse were not attempted. Everything was set down in the familiar form and fashion of the popular speech and in genuine native words and direct unincumbered sentences. The delicacy of a scholarly taste

no doubt influenced the English of More and his contemporaries and immediate followers, but their eloquence was not the effect of any conscious endeavor to write in English as they would have written in what were called the learned tongues.

The age indeed of critical cultivation of the language had begun; but at first that object was pursued wisely and well, upon sound principles, notwithstanding that Roger Ascham ridiculed the employment of casual French, Latin, or Italian words—this purism being foolish, applied to a language so essentially a mixed tongue. The Gothic part is married to the Latin, and, as in other unions, what God has joined no man can sunder. Ascham's *Toxophilus* was followed by an elaborate treatise by Thomas Wilson on the subject of English composition, *The Art of Rhetoric*, impressing the same rules that Ascham had laid down with regard to purity of style and the general rules of writing well.

The English poetical literature of the first half of the sixteenth century may be fairly described as the dawn of a new day. Two names of some note belong to the reign of Henry VII., Stephen Hawes and Alexander Barklay. Hawes is the author of many pieces, chiefly his *Pastime of Pleasure* and *La Belle Pucelle*. Warton holds this performance to be the only effort of imagination and invention which had appeared in our poetry since Chaucer. Lydgate and Hawes may stand together as the two writers who in the century and a half that followed the death of Chaucer contributed most to carry forward the regulation and modernization of the language which he began. But the poetry with the truest life in it, produced in the reign of Henry VII. and the earlier part of that of his son, is undoubtedly that of Skelton. We take a stanza from his *Book of Philip Sparrow*, which is full of animation :

“ For this most goodly flower,  
This blossom of fresh color,  
So Jupiter me succour,  
She flourisheth new and new  
In beauty and virtue;  
*Hac claritate gemina,  
O, gloriosa femina,*” etc.

To this era belong Roy and Haywood, and, in Scotland, Douglas, Dunbar, and Lindsay.

Lindsay died in 1567. Before that date a revival of the higher poetry had come upon England like the rising of a new day. Two names at the head of this movement shine resplendent, viz., Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Sir Thomas Wyatt. Surrey restored to poetry a correctness, polish, and general spirit of refinement such as it had not known since Chaucer's time, and of which in

the language as now spoken there was no previous example. To this add that he was the first in this age who sought to modulate his strains after that elder poetry of Italy, which thenceforward became one of the chief fountain-heads of inspiration to that of England through the times of Spenser, of Shakespeare, and of Milton. The poetry of Wyatt makes up for its ruggedness by a force and depth of sentiment which Surrey does not reach. Their poems were published together in 1557. To Surrey also we may attribute the present form of blank verse.

The greater portion of what is called the Elizabethan era appertains to the reign of James—to the seventeenth, not to the sixteenth century. The classical Elizabethan poetry dates only from about the middle of the reign, and the same may be said of other forms of literature; most of what was produced in the earlier half of it is constrained, harsh, and immature, and still bears upon it the impress of the preceding barbarism, resulting from the upheaval of religion and the family from their old foundations. Nearly coincident with the commencement of this era is the appearance of a singular work, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, a collection of the lives of various remarkable English historical personages, the idea of which is taken from Boccaccio. It was written, or rather begun, by Sir Thomas Sackville, who gave it up to Richard Baldwynne and George Ferrers, and its first appearance was in quarto in 1559.

The first introduction of dramatic representations was as early as the twelfth century, and continued to the fifteenth in the form of miracle plays. Mr. Collier, the latest and best historian of the English drama, says: "The moral plays were able to keep possession of the stage so long because of their gradual improvement in composition, and partly because, under the form of allegorical fiction and abstract character, the writers introduced matters which covertly touched upon public events, popular prejudices, and temporary opinions." Long before, however, the ancient drama had assumed an entirely new form. John Heywood's interludes first exhibited the moral or miracle play in the transition state to the regular tragedy and comedy. Mr. Collier says of them that they "form a class by themselves; they are neither miracle plays nor moral plays, but what may be properly termed interludes"—a species of writing of which he has a claim to be considered the inventor, although the term was applied generally in the reign of Edward IV.

The earliest English comedy, properly so called, is Udale's "Ralph Roister Doister," issued in the early part of the sixteenth century. And if the regular drama made its first appearance in the shape of comedy, her tragic sister was not far behind. It



may be supposed that one species of the grave drama of real life, viz., the historical, was evolved out of the shadowy world of allegorical representations. Of what may be called the transition from the moral play to the historical we have an example in Bale's drama of "Kynge John," in which the real personages and the allegorical jostled each other. On the 18th of January, 1562, was shown before the Queen's most excellent Majesty, in Her Highness's Court of Whitehall, by the gentlemen of the Inner Temple, the tragedy of "Goborduc," the production of Sackville and T. Norton. From this time until Shakespeare there were many writers in this form, but none deserving special mention, and they all pale their ineffectual fires before his effulgence, and are forgotten except in encyclopædias and the collections of the bibliomaniac.

Of the early Elizabethan pure writers we may mention Lyly, Sidney Nash, etc.; the first of these was the inventor of a singular affectation called euphuism. Some notion of this style may be gathered by the reader from the discourse of Sir Piercie Shafton in Scott's *Monastery*. "In the six or seven years from 1590 to 1596 what a world of wealth had been added to our poetry by Spenser alone, 'and what a different thing from what it was before had the English language been made by his writings, to natives, to foreigners, and to all posterity.'" So does Craik break forth into rapture. England was then a tuneful land, and the most productive and busiest age of our poetical literature had finally commenced. Minor poets counted themselves by hundreds, and not altogether without merit; among the greater names were Warner, Drayton, and Daniel; after them follow Hale, Sylvester, Chapman, Harrington, Fairfax, and all the rest. Nor must we omit Dr. Donne, Dean of St. Paul's, who between writing sermons and essays against "Popery" could burst out into a song so delicious as the following :

"Sweetest love, I do not go  
For weariness of thee,  
Nor in hope the world can show  
A fitter love for me;  
But, since that I  
Must die at last, 'tis best  
Thus to use myself in jest,  
By feigned death to die."

He who approaches us now in the long procession towers above all who have gone before or will come after; yet so superb are his proportions, and so harmonious the relations of the parts to the whole, that while we feel an awe in the contemplation of his grandeur we are soothed by his human sympathy rather than frightened by his superior mental altitude. William Shakespeare

was born in 1564. His earlier pieces, *Venus and Adonis*, *Tarquin and Lucrece*, *Passionate Pilgrim*, and the *Sonnets*, appeared from 1593 to 1609. His genius wrought a grand revolution in the national drama, and he rendered all his predecessors obsolete. He first informed this branch of composition with true wit and humor, pathos, dignity, and sublimity. He infused into it the spirit of reality also; for where is to be found another such anatomist of the human heart? Who, before or since, has touched its chords to such fine issues, laid bare its strength and weakness? Where else can we look for the tenderness of a Juliet, the frenzy of a Lear, the sublime melancholy of a Hamlet, the blind pitiful wrath of an Othello, or the finesse of an Iago, the hate of Shylock, the terrific strength of purpose of Lady Macbeth, the winning beauty of Rosalind, and gentle Desdemona? Men and manners of all ages and climes, from the frozen shores of barbaric Denmark to the classic shades of cultured Greece; Roman patrician and the royalty of Egypt; the Romanic Britain and the Britain before the Roman invasion; the Scot contemporaneous with the English heptarchy; England and France in the Middle Ages, and all ranks from the end of the fourteenth to the middle of the sixteenth century, not to speak of the poetry and romance of Venice and Verona, Mantua and Padua, Illyria and Navarre, and the Forest of Arden. Apart from his dramatic power Shakespeare was the greatest *poet* that ever lived. His sympathy was universal, his imagination the most plastic, and his diction the most expressive. This marvellous being was human, however, and it came to him as it comes to all, the time to "shuffle off this mortal coil." Shakespeare died in 1616. Other dramatists lived during this time: so are stars in the sky at noonday. Beaumont and Fletcher have left us the richest and most magnificent drama after Shakespeare. "Rare" Ben Jonson illy deserves the distinction, except for the exquisite song:

" Drink to me only with thine eyes,  
And I will pledge with mine;  
Or leave a kiss but in the cup,  
And I'll not look for wine.  
The thirst that from the soul doth rise,  
Doth ask a drink divine;  
But might I of love's nectar sup,  
I would not change from thine."

Next we have Massinger and Ford. By the end of the sixteenth century prose in its highest examples, if it lost in ease and clearness, had gained in copiousness, in sonorousness, and in splendor. In the lower specimens simplicity and directness gave place to long-winded wordiness, and towards the close of Elizabeth's reign a singularly artificial mode became fashionable, more

especially in sermons. The translations of the Bible made by the "Reformers" cannot claim a high place either as literary works or for correctness. This form of writing was very tempting from its novelty, and "men rushed in where angels feared to tread" and with like consequences. In this age we have theological writers in great numbers, and more or less, generally less, elegance of diction. Men seemed to feel that in this new field they could not sow enough seeds of tares. Catholic literature was to a degree extinguished in England from the close of the reign of Henry VIII., and books, if written there, were sent to France for publication, and circulated in their native country secretly. As Catholic teachings were eliminated from the English schools as well as from English morals, the wonderfully boasted "freedom of inquiry" led to its natural conclusion, of which it has reached its highest point at the present day in the Socialism which threatens to do away with all law and order, and in Darwinism, which relegates man, the God-given ruler of the brutes, to the lowest grade of his subjects. There were intellectual giants in those days as there were before, but their intellects were like a ship without a rudder, like "sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh." Of these, in the seventeenth century, Francis Bacon is the most colossal. Of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, a collection of out of the way learning, Dr. Johnson said it was the only book that could draw him out of bed an hour sooner than he would otherwise get up. As an historian of the world, a gigantic undertaking, comes Sir Walter Raleigh, besides giving us some minor poems. Another celebrated work of the times is Richard Knolle's *History of the Turks*, published in 1610. Johnson, in the *Rambler*, gives Knolle the first place among English historians, and Mr. Hallam does not quarrel with this dictum.

If we except the productions of the last fifty or sixty years we may safely say that whatever of the literature that by right of its shape or spirit belongs peculiarly to the language and the country—in other words, English national literature—reached its meridian splendor, during the last quarter of the sixteenth and the first quarter of the seventeenth century. After that, however, there was a reflected glory, which lasted for another half century and longer, in fact, until the middle of the reign of Charles II. The chief glory of the Elizabethan literature, however, belongs to the time we have gone over. To the dramatic style succeeded the strictly religious, and such writers as Quarles, Herrick, Herbert, and Crashaw took the place of Shakespeare and the rest. Crashaw was, after Donne, the greatest of the religious poets of this age. He became a Catholic and died a Canon of Loretto in 1650. Both the poetry and prose of this era continued to be infected by the spirit of quaintness and conceit, or over refinement and subtlety of

thought, for nearly a century after the first introduction of that form of writing. The style in question was borrowed from Italy ; and as we received the malady from one foreign literature we are indebted for its cure to another—the influence of the French, which had begun to be felt long before the Restoration, owing to the connection, through Henrietta Maria, between the two courts. The distinguishing characteristics of French poetry (and indeed of French art generally), viz., neatness in dressing the thought, had been carried to a great height by Malherbe, Racan, and others, and these may be considered the inspirers of Waller, Carew, Lovelace, and Suckling. Sir John Denham was the author of a remarkable poem, *Cooper's Hill*, which made its appearance in 1642, and immediately drew universal attention. But the Cavalier poet who did his cause the stoutest service was John Cleveland, who was the first writer who came forth as a champion of the royal cause in England. And the cause of Puritanism and the Parliament had also its poet, as had that of love and loyalty. Wither and Marvel were the most eminent of these. We will give a quotation from the former :

“ Ere God his wrath on Balaam wreaks,  
First by his ass to him he speaks ;  
Then shows him in an angel's hand  
A sword, his courses to command ;  
But seeing still he forward went,  
Quite through his heart a sword he sent.  
And God will thus, if thus they do,  
Still deal with kings and subjects too ;  
That where his grace dispersed is grown,  
He by his judgments may be known.”

He also wrote songs of thanksgiving for victories and fine weather and other matters, but we have no room for further specimens.

Most of the prose published in England in the middle of this century was political and theological, and little of it has any claim to a place in national literature. Charles I. was no mean contributor to the subject we are reviewing. We see now approach another giant, not so superb as Shakespeare or Chaucer, but grand in his own gloomy way. John Milton was born in 1608 or thereabouts. We must make room for two contrasting specimens of his style ; the one from *Comus* is exquisitely graceful !

“ Sabinia fair,  
Listen where thou art sitting,  
Under the glassy, cool, translucent wave,  
In twisted braids of lilies, knitting  
The loose train of thy amber-dropping hair ;  
Listen for dear honor's sake,  
Goddess of the silver lake  
Listen and save.”

In turning the pages of *Paradise Lost*, our attention is caught by the following:

“Me miserable, which way shall I fly  
Infinite wrath and infinite despair?  
Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell;  
And, in the lowest deep, a lower deep  
Still threatening to devour me opens wide,  
To which the Hell I suffer seems a Heaven.”

The proper era of newspapers begins with the Tory Parliament. Previous to that there were chronicles of news issued at various times and in various forms, from the time of the Spanish Armada. These newspapers were an outgrowth of the times of turbulence and anxiety in which they had their birth, and were gradually transformed from weekly to daily. When they began, the series of the old chroniclers ceased with Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle of the Kings of England*, first published in folio in 1641.

So it appears that the age of the Civil War and the Commonwealth was not an *absolute* blank in the history of our highest literature; but, unless we except Milton and Jeremy Taylor and Sir Thomas Browne, no genius of great lustre appeared, from the Tory Parliament till the Restoration. The unprinted plays of Beaumont and Fletcher were sent to press because the theatres were closed, and Shirley occasionally issued a commonplace new one, and all other poetry as well was nearly silent; the siren voice was lost in the din of arms and of theological and political strife, and was more effectually silenced by triumphant Puritanism, whose crop-eared followers boasted that it had put down all the arts never again to lift their heads in England. This silence of the muses is much more remarkable in the tranquillity under the Parliament than in the turmoil of the war which preceded. During the war we have Milton, Taylor, Fuller, and Browne; Denham, Cowley, Herrick, Lovelace, and Hobbes, etc., up to 1651. After this date for some years there is an absolute blank. Cromwell however was more liberal, and in 1655 we have Fuller's *Church History*, Harrington's *Oceana*, etc. It is to be noted that with one exception, the gloomy Milton, none of these writers were Parliamentarians, for Waller and Dryden made up amply for their brief conformity. Denham, Browne, Taylor, Herrick, Lovelace, Fuller, Hales, Hobbes, and Cowley were, all of them, consistent, and, most of them, ardent royalists. Harrington, in theory a republican, was a royalist by personal attachments.

Following these comes John Dryden; born in 1632, and beginning to write early, his genius did not reach its meridian until his life was more than half past. He is by some considered the founder

of a new school, but really it is more strictly true that he carried to a higher, perhaps the highest perfection, a style of poetry cultivated long before, the satiric. As a dramatic writer he was a gross imitator of French models. His *Alexander's Feast* was one of his last works; brilliant and poetical, its birth was in a time of great sadness. A Catholic and a royalist he was bound to a conquered party and shared its humiliations. He died at the age of sixty-nine. Barrow and Bunyan also left their impress on this age.

"With the Constitution of 1688," says Taine, "a new spirit appears in England. Slowly, gradually, the moral revolution accompanies the social; man changes with the state; in the same sense and through the same causes character moulds itself to the situation, and little by little, in manners and in literature, we trace the empire of a serious, reflective, moral spirit, capable of discipline and independence, which can alone maintain and give effect to a constitution."

In view of the reigns of William, after Mary's death, of Anne and the Georges, we demur to the use of the word "moral" in the above quotation, and indeed, the author himself acknowledges that, *at first sight*, it would seem that England gained nothing by the revolution of which she was so proud. "The aspect of things under William, Anne, and the first two Georges is repulsive," he adds with amusing candor, and we agree with him.

This revolution, brought on by the same causes that had given birth to the Commonwealth, and restoring to a certain extent the same condition of things, came like a blighting frost upon the higher literature of the country. Some few of the writers of the preceding period survived—Dryden, Lee, Etherege, and Wycherly are among the best, nor must we exclude Sir William Temple and Richard Baxter, Burnet, Tillotson and South.

The first name which belongs exclusively to the reign after the revolution is that of John Locke. The *Tale of a Tub*, and a tract entitled the *Battle of the Books*, published together in 1704, first drew the attention of the public to the afterwards world-renowned Dean Swift, the greatest master of satire, at once comic and caustic, that has yet appeared in our language. We cannot better describe his genius and writings than in the words of his friend Pope:

"Oh thou! whatever title please thine ear,  
Dean, Drapier, Bickerstaff, or Gulliver!  
Whether thou choose Cervantes' serious air,  
Or laugh and shake in Rabelais' easy chair,  
Or praise the court, or magnify mankind,  
Or thy grieved country's copper chains unbind—"

He was undoubtedly the most masculine intellect of his age, the most earnest thinker in a time when these were fewer than in any

other era of the literature. Of his contemporaries the most memorable name is that of Alexander Pope; and after them come Addison and Steele. These two were the chief boast of the Whigs, as the two preceding were of the Tories. But it is as the first and best of the English essayists, the principal authors of *The Sutler*, *The Spectator*, and *The Guardian* that we remember these Whig writers.

A new group of figures heretofore unknown in the world of letters approaches us,—the modern novelists. The productions of this class are as different from the “novels” of Spain and the Middle Ages as the miracle plays are from the dramas of Shakespeare and Beaumont and Fletcher. The first to strike the keynote of this symphony was De Foe; but except his *Robinson Crusoe* he is little read in the present day. Addison and Swift also entered this new field. But the novels which took the greatest hold upon the public, and may still be read with some degree of pleasure, are those of Fielding and Richardson. Smollett and Sterne also deserve a place among the best, although their rudeness and vulgarity grate harshly upon a sensitive modern ear; *Peregrine Pickle* and *Tristram Shandy*, however, must have a place in every library. But the time is fast approaching when purified manners will impress their purity upon this mirror of society *par excellence*. We now meet Oliver Goldsmith, and whether “remote, unfriended, melancholy, slow, or by the lazy Scheldt or wandering Po,” we find him; or visit with him “sweet Auburn! loveliest village of the plain;” or follow with him the perplexing fortunes of the Vicar, he is always charming. Here in this procession which has filed past us for so many centuries we find a singular figure for an age of refinement; it would seem better suited to the barbarism of the Saxon. A man whose “person was large, robust, approaching to the gigantic, and grown unwieldy from corpulency, with a gloomy and coarse air,” his countenance disfigured by the king’s evil, etc., in a word, Dr. Samuel Johnson. And with him his shadow, Boswell, most charming, because so *naïve*, of biographers. In the hands of Miss Burney the novel became proper, prudish, and—poor.

After Pope we have the poets Prior and Parnell, Garth and Blackmore, Broome and Fenton, and many other minor writers, among whom, because of the small quantity of their productions and their brevity, are classed Collins, Shenstone, and Gray. Thomas Young and Thomson step at once to the front rank. Who has not realized the truth of the former’s apostrophe to

“Tired Nature’s sweet restorer, balmy Sleep!  
He, like the world, his ready visit pays  
Where fortune smiles; the wretched he forsakes;  
Swift on his downy pinions flies from woe,  
And lights on lids unsullied by a tear.”

Among the female writers of this age—and, with the exception of the royal Tudor sisters and their unhappy cousin, Lady Jane Grey, it is almost the first time we have seen a woman's face in the long line—we count beside Miss Burney, Mrs. Cowley, Mrs. Sheridan, Mrs. Burke, Mrs. Lennox, Miss Sophia Lee, blind Anna Williams, Mrs. Carter, Miss Talbot, Mrs. Montague, Mrs. Chapone, Mrs. Macauley, Mrs. Hannah More, Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. Charlotte Smith, Mrs. Inchbald, and Lady Mary Wortley Montague. *Place aux dames!* a goodly company certainly.

In the latter part of George II.'s reign a feature of that of Anne was revived. I mean the periodical essay. Among letter-writers we have Horace Walpole and Lord Chesterfield; in politics Wilkes, and the great unknown *Junius*, and Burke; in metaphysics and ethics Clarke, Berkeley, Earl Shaftesbury, Mandeville, Butler, and Hume, a few among the many; again we have Hume among the historians, with Robertson and Gibbon; but the list grows too long, we cannot particularize.

With Cowper, who wrote that

“ John Gilpin was a citizen  
Of credit and renown—  
A train band captain eke was he,  
Of famous London town.”

And who thus expresses his own or Alexander Selkirk's views :

“ Oh Solitude! where are the charms  
That sages have found in thy face?  
Better dwell in the midst of alarms  
Than reign in this horrible place.”

Not that he cannot rise to higher themes with an eloquence worthy of them, as in *The Task* :

“ Not only vice disposes and prepares  
The mind, that slumbers sweetly in her snares,  
To stoop to tyranny's usurped command,  
And bend her polished neck beneath his hand  
(A dire effect, by one of nature's laws,  
Unchangeably connected with its cause);  
But Providence himself will intervene,  
To throw his dark displeasure o'er the scene.”

With Cowper, then, and Darwin, and Burns, the eighteenth cen-



ture closes. The latter will live when the others are forgotten, for who can go to Scotland and not visit

“ Ye banks and braes, and streams around  
The Castle o’ Montgomery,  
Green be your woods and fair your flowers,  
Your waters never drumlie !  
There summer first unfauld her robes,  
And there the longest tarry !  
For there I took the last farewell  
O’ my sweet Highland Mary.”

And who, if looking for a love song, could find one more exquisite than this :

“ Oh, my love is like a red, red rose !  
That’s newly sprung in June ;  
Oh ! my love is like a melodie  
That’s sweetly sung in tune.  
Oh ! fair art thou, my bonnie lass ;  
So deep in love am I,  
That I will love thee still, my dear,  
Till all the seas gang dry—  
Till all the seas gang dry, my dear,  
And the rocks melt in the sun ;  
For I will love thee still, my dear,  
While the sands of life shall run.”

And again, the passionate cry—

“ Had we never loved sae kindly,  
Had we never loved sae blindly,  
Never met and never parted,  
We had ne’er been broken-hearted !”

Does it not come home to many sad hearts ?

So the age of the noblest classics ended with a ploughman’s song !

With the nineteenth century began in Europe the great modern revolution. The human mind had changed again, and with this change arose a new literature. It seems almost as if there was something in the termination of one century and the beginning of another to awaken and act with fructifying power upon the literature of England. The latter period of this literature has been divided into three parts: the first, that of Elizabeth, threw its splendor over the latter part of the sixteenth and the first of the seventeenth century ; the second is called the Augustan age of Anne, and shone through the earlier years of the eighteenth ; and now we have reached the third, ushered in by the nineteenth century. And here we have at least ten poetical writers, at the termination of George III.’s reign in 1820, each one of whom holds by right a high rank: Crabbe, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Scott, Campbell, Moore, Byron,

Shelley, and Keats. Many others might be added to the list, but these were listened to by all and acknowledged by all. The awakening of English literature at each of these three periods has been brought about undoubtedly by the general political and social circumstances of the country and the world.

Wordsworth was born in 1770, and his first poems appeared in 1793. He, with Coleridge and Southey, belonged to the "Lake School," and although the former wore the Laureate's crown of bays, and all wrote copiously, it was not until Sir Walter Scott appeared that poetry became the rage. It was only after achieving a brilliant reputation as a poet that Scott discovered his talent as a prose writer, and so won a second laurel. His poems are all lays and romances of chivalry, and are infinitely finer than anything of the kind ever before written. The *Lay of the Last Minstrel* surprised all readers; it carries one on with an excitement of heart as well as of head; while the *Lady of the Lake* awakens tender sentiments and thrills through the very core of our affections. From *Marmion* we quote:

"The war, that for a space did fail,  
Now trebly thundering swelled the gale,  
And Stanley! was the cry:  
A light on Marmion's visage spread,  
And fired his glazing eye:  
With dying hand, above his head,  
He shook the fragment of his blade,  
And shouted 'Victory!'  
'Charge, Chester, charge! On, Stanley, on!'  
Were the last words of Marmion."

The close of the poem is grandly sad:

"Tradition, legend, tune and song  
Shall many an age that wail prolong!  
Still from the sire the son shall hear  
Of the stern strife, and carnage drear,  
Of Flodden's fatal field,  
Where shivered was fair Scotland's spear,  
And broken was her shield!"

But we have anticipated, and mention has not been made of those who preceded Scott (one of whom was almost, in fact in his own line, fully, as sweet a singer), Crabbe, Campbell, and Moore. Crabbe's first poem, *The Library*, was published as far back as 1781. Campbell wrote,

"On Linden, when the sun was low,  
All spotless lay the untrodden snow,  
And dark as winter was the flow  
Of Iser rolling rapidly!"

early in the century. Then his pen lay idle for five or six years. In *Gertrude of Wyoming* he resumed his wooing of the muse, and afterwards wrote the exquisite *O' Connor's Child*; or, *The Flower of Love lies Bleeding*!"

"Oh, once the harp of Innisfail  
Was tuned full high to notes of gladness,  
But yet it oftener told a tale  
Of more prevailing sadness."

His *Pleasures of Hope* were written previous to *Hohenlinden*; *The Battle of the Baltic*, and *Mariners of England*, early before he took a rest. Moore's songs still hold their own, and are the sweetest ever written. His *Lalla Rookh*, so infused with the very soul of Eastern life and custom, is a marvel from having been written without the author ever visiting the spots he describes so truly. To Byron we are indirectly indebted for the Waverley Novels. His poetic genius was so superb and all-embracing as to throw his contemporaries into the shade, and with them Scott, who immediately yielded the place and turned to a field in which he has no master. However the poet's private life must be blamed, however much the egotism and irreligion of the man pervade his writings, Byron has put himself upon a pedestal before his countrymen from which there has been no hand, as yet, powerful enough to displace him. Shelley and Byron were friends and congenial spirits. Keats gave promise of much, but his early death prevented the fruition; his *Ode to a Nightingale* is very beautiful:

"My heart aches, and a drowsy numbness pains  
My senses, as though of hemlock I had drunk,  
Or emptied some dull opiate to the drains  
The minute past, and Letheward had sunk:  
'Tis not through envy of thy happy lot,  
But being too happy in thine happiness—  
That thou, a light-winged Dryad of the trees,  
In some melodious plot  
Of beechen green, and shadows numberless,  
Singest of summer in full-throated ease."

The poem is too long to quote in full. The names of Shelley, Keats and Byron cannot be mentioned without bringing before us a fourth, their friend and companion,—Leigh Hunt. He had attracted attention before Shelley or Keats did. He is a true poet, and has put a living soul into whatever he has written. I wish I had space for the story of *Sultan Mahmoud*. It cannot be given in part. Nor can we here fail to remember another son of the Green Isle and of the Church, who hid his genius under the heavy cloak of a poor Christian Brother. Gerald Griffin wrote enough in prose and verse to entitle him to a high rank

among his peers. His *Collegians* is still read, and has been put into a form which will thrill Irish hearts all over the world as long as the theatre is tolerated. His poetry is sweet and touching. The Banim brothers also belong to this nineteenth century's literature.

With these names ends one phase of the nineteenth century's contributions to the literature of England. As to the rest we come too near our own day for much mention.

Let us take a retrospective view, then, of the forms and times which have passed before us. At the beginning comes the race, the people, Angles, Saxons, and Danish. Out of this mixture is to grow the nation, and by very slow processes it does grow. Christianity does its work, and ever in the wake of the Church come learning and letters, and men are awakened to the fact that they are not as the beasts which perish, that they have souls to save, and that God walked among them to show them how to save their souls. Then come the Normans, and difficult as the amalgamation of the two peoples is, it is not so desperate a task as it would be if they did not kneel at the same altars. Here again the Church was the salvation of the peoples. And so as the nation grew in stature it grew in grace with God and man, and the intellect bestowed upon Adam to mark his dominion over all creation was fostered and cultivated by the same power which guided souls along the dark and narrow way that leads to eternal light. Without the Church all would have been blankness and darkness in souls and minds. Then comes one of those eras when the demon is unloosed and allowed to work his will upon mankind, and only for the remembrance of the former blessed light, and a dim reflection of its glory, the world would have again gone down into destruction at the hands of Luther and his compeers. Slowly ever since has the national literature of England been recovering from this blow, but it is only in proportion as the Church is recognized and free that it progresses. Thus we see the true history of literature is the history of man, for the soul of literature is but the soul of man.

What is properly a review or history of literature should close here, for history takes cognizance only of what is past; but we will not end this article without a short review of the Victorian era, an era as rich as any of its predecessors, and one which possesses perhaps more interest to us. The literary greatness of this age however, is manifested mostly in prose. Perhaps, too, in no other period has there been so much activity of female genius and talent, principally in fictitious narrative, yet ranging above and beyond that. At the head of this list, however we may reprobate the

work she did in Italy, we must place Elizabeth Barrett Browning; and she stands not only at the head of female writers, but of all writers in verse. We may even go further, and call her the greatest woman poet who ever lived, except Sappho, if *she* lived. There are no love poems in the language like her *Sonnets from the Portuguese*. I must find room for one :

“ If thou must love me, let it be for nought  
 Except for love's sake only. Do not say  
 ‘ I love her for her smile, her look, her way  
 Of speaking gently ; for a trick of thought  
 That falls in well with mine, and certes brought  
 A sense of pleasant ease on such a day ;’  
 For these things, in themselves beloved, may  
 Be changed, or change for thee, and love so wrought  
 May be unwrought so. Neither love me for  
 Thine own dear pity's wiping my cheeks dry—  
 A creature might forget to weep, who bore  
 Thy comfort long, and lose thy love thereby !  
 But love me for love's sake, that evermore  
 Thou mayst love on through love's eternity.”

Of her husband we cannot speak so enthusiastically. In fact we don't pretend to understand much that he has written, but we can never forget the rats in

“ Hamelin town in Brunswick,  
 By famous Hanover city ;  
 The river Weser, deep and wide,  
 Washes its walls on the southern side ;  
 A pleasanter spot you never spied ;  
 But when begins my ditty,  
 Almost five hundred years ago,  
 To see the townsfolk suffer so  
 From vermin, was a pity.  
 Rats !  
 They fought the dogs and killed the cats,  
 And bit the babies in the cradles,  
 And ate the cheeses out of the vats,  
 And licked the soup from the cook's own ladles.”

As a specimen of another kind take the concluding lines of *Paracelsus* :

“ I go to prove my soul !  
 I see my way as birds their trackless way—  
 I shall arrive ! what time, what circuit first,  
 I ask not ; but, unless God send his hail,  
 Or blinding fireballs, sleet, or stifling snow,  
 In some time—his own good time—I shall arrive ;  
 He guides me and the bird. In his good time !”

Place now for the Laureate. How many who read Tennyson understand him? He has caught the spirit of the old legends wonderfully in *The Idylls*, and his *Maud* and *Lockesley Hall* are very beautiful, as well as some others of his poems. But of Tennyson in poetry, as of Thalberg in music, it may be said his art is more to him in its form than in its soul, and in refining the former the latter suffers. Still there are some wonderfully beautiful things, as, for instance, Arthur's farewell to Sir Bedevere :

"If thou shouldst never see my face again,  
Pray for my soul. *More things are wrought  
By prayer than this world dreams of!*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
For so the whole round earth is every way  
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

And again in *Lockesley Hall* :

"Love took up the glass of time, and turned it in his glowing hands;  
Every moment lightly shaken, ran itself in golden sands.  
Love took up the harp of life, and smote on all the chords with might;  
Smote the chord of self, that, trembling, passed in music out of sight."

We must not neglect Hood. The future will recognize him as a poet of the first-class. His *Lost Heir* is full of genuine Irish life. His *Song of the Shirt* is a truthful picture :

"Stitch, stitch, stitch,  
Band and gusset and seam,  
Till over the buttons I fall asleep,  
And sew them on in a dream!"

How many can sympathize with the

"One more unfortunate  
Weary of breath;  
Rashly importunate,  
Gone to her death!"

In novels the list of authors is unending; at the head stands Dickens, Thackeray, and "George Eliot," Bulwer, Miss Mulock, Black, and Blackmore; and how many others come crowding on! As a critic and historian combined Macaulay stands alone; Carlyle, too, occupies a pinnacle entirely to himself as philosopher and historian. Then we have Stuart Mills and his collaborateurs. Although our own literature, by reason of its language and nature, really belongs to that of England, we will not cross the seas. The laurels and bays that crown the heads of the writers of our own land have been placed there by a nation proud of her young children and their youthful promise. The time is not ripe for other than a loving glance over the by no means insignificant list, and each one can choose, as he or she, gazes, whomsoever the one so gazing thinks worthy of the wreath.

ENGLISH DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY  
IN THE OLDEN TIME.

*Pietas Mariana Britannica.* A History of English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye, Mother of God. With a Catalogue of Shrines, Sanctuaries, Offerings, Bequests, and other Memorials of the Piety of our Forefathers. By Edmund Waterton, F.S.A., Knight of the Order of Christ, of Rome. (Published by Subscription. Quarto. Pp. XVI., 266, 320.) London, St. Joseph's Catholic Library, 48 South Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

IT is very natural that American visitors to England should be especially interested in the grand old cathedrals, and still more, perhaps, in the numerous ruined or half-ruined abbeys and monasteries with which the whole country is studded. These remains of an ancient faith, or, rather, of ages when the everlasting faith which now flourishes in the New World as well as in the Old, reigned in all its majesty and beauty over the whole face of England, have a peculiar charm for the faithful children of the Church whose home lies in the newly discovered continent which the Christian nations of Europe have had the mission of colonizing. Brightly as the light of the Catholic Church may burn in America, and glorious as may be the future which is reserved for her in the New World, she cannot, by the necessity of the case, possess any monuments such as those of which we speak. The Catholics of the United States and Canada will, as we trust, cover the land of their birth or of their adoption with glorious churches and religious houses, and no Englishman of their creed will wish them anything less than that they may even surpass their ancestors in the Old World in their devotion and piety. Providence has placed them in possession of a country such as never before fell to the lot of a young people to receive from His all-bountiful hands. Its natural resources are inexhaustible, and its political circumstances and position among the nations of the globe insure it a peaceful future, very unlike indeed to the early struggles of that Christian Europe, of which its people are the children. The development of Catholicity in the northern half of America is the most significant and consoling feature in the annals of the Church in the century in which we live. We can see no reason for doubting the future prosperity and magnificence of the Church in these countries,—and prosperous and magnificent it is,—and it will most certainly stamp the marks of its power and resources upon the face of the land in which it dwells, as the mediæval Church has stamped itself upon Europe. Everywhere we shall see fine churches dedicated to the worship of God, everywhere we shall see the minster rise in the

midst of the town, the great abbeys and monasteries of European Christendom will not be wanting, while by their side will be seen those more modern creations of religious zeal, which have been called into existence by the special wants of our time,—the convents of Friars and Sisters of Mercy and of Charity, the hospitals and schools and colleges in which the needs of the sick and the aged and the poor and the children calling for Christian instruction and training will be met. But all this development will be new. It will take generations to give to its monuments the air of indescribable solemnity and majesty which hangs over the works of ages long gone by, and we trust that it may be long indeed before the hand of the spoiler and destroyer is let loose on them, to endow them with the plaintive and mournful beauty which hangs over such places as Fountain Abbey, or Tintern, or Glastonbury. It is well that ruins at all events should be to be seen only in Europe, even though America may lose something in not having to show to her Catholic children the witness to the ancient faith which such ruins embody.

Foremost among the items of that witness, as borne by all that remains to us, in so many different ways, of the England of the Ages of Faith, is the truth that nowhere was there a more deeply rooted and more widespread devotion and love towards the Blessed Mother of God. It must be a matter of certainty, that what remains to us of evidence, as to this fact, cannot be but the hundredth part of the evidence which might have been gathered in the Ages of Faith themselves; yet it would take a lifetime to collect such proofs as survive to us, and the collector would always find the evidence accumulating upon him. To our mind there is something far more precious about this testimony of the faith of our ancestors than anything that can be measured by feeling alone. The connection between piety and the practical and vivid realization of the doctrine on which piety is fed, is indisputable. The reason why the devotion to Our Blessed Lady wrote itself in so many beautiful ways on the daily life of our ancestors was, not that they were men and women of more tender feelings than ourselves, but that they lived in an atmosphere of faith, without any contact of heresy, and probably with much less of worldliness in it, and thus were able to penetrate their whole existence with the great truths which we believe as they believed, but which have less influence on our lives and our habitual thoughts. We have much to learn, indeed, from the numerous manners in which the devotion of the English of old times vented itself. It is on this account, as well as on account of the intrinsic beauty of its contents, that we value the handsome volume in which Mr. Waterton has given us the fruits of researches for many years as to the point of which we speak. It is some-



thing, no doubt, to prove that England was the dowry of Mary, and that her children showed in every possible way and on every possible occasion their devotion to their liege Lady. But it is something more, that we can learn so much from the forms which their devotion took, and that, perhaps, in this way, many holy and most salutary practices may be revived, which may help future generations to the better expression of a love and confidence, which in the hearts of true Christians can be second only (if such comparisons are to be made between two things which are in truth identical) to the love and confidence with which they turn to Our Most Blessed Lord Himself.

The child of an old English family, and of an unbroken line of Catholic ancestry, Mr. Waterton tells us that he was imbued from his earliest years with a most tender devotion to Our Blessed Lady. He has spent much time and labor in gradually collecting from monuments of antiquity of every kind, the traces which occur of that widespread devotion to Our Lady of which we speak. The result of his researches first appeared in a series of papers which were printed in successive numbers of *The Month and Catholic Review*, containing a list, alphabetically arranged, of parishes, churches, and towns in England, concerning which there was evidence remaining, either in the shape of monuments or documentary records, of the devotion of our forefathers to Our Blessed Lady. This list now appears as the second part of a large and handsome volume, which has been printed and issued by the managers of the *Review* already mentioned. A first part is prefixed, in which the author goes through the whole subject of the various ways in which the devotion of which we speak manifested itself. This part of the work, therefore, is altogether new, and it embodies an immense amount of carefully sifted information. The list of places in England (including a few in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales) as to which some notes are included in the alphabetical list, is not far short of three hundred. We shall endeavor to cull a few flowers from this part of the volume as we go on, but our chief business will be with the preliminary matter, which occupies about the same amount of space as the other.

This first part of the volume, which we owe to Mr. Waterton's industrious and unwearied devotion, contains altogether three parts, each of which is divided into several sections or chapters. The first part gives an account, as we may say, of the personal devotion to Our Blessed Lady on the part of various classes of men at every age of life. The author first, however, lingers over the old title of the "Dower of Mary," which seems to have been officially used from the reign of Richard the Second, and which is spoken of as a matter of "common parlance" in a document of the last year of

the reign of that unfortunate monarch. This document is a mandate of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which Englishmen are spoken of as the liegemen of Our Lady's especial dower—" *Peculiaris Dotis Adscriptitii*." The same title is formally used by later writers. Then follows a chapter on the name of Our Blessed Lady, in which the author points out the reverence which in early ages prevented parents from calling their children by the sweetest of female names. This was wonderfully kept up in Ireland, the beautiful language of the Irish race enabling them to make a compound word of the two which signified "Servant of Mary,"—*Maelmuire*,—a name which was borne by kings and other men as well as by women. The chapter which follows is very interesting as containing some short notices of the manner in which children of old were taught to venerate and pray to Our Blessed Lady. We all remember the beautiful story in Chaucer of the child who was murdered by the Jews for singing, as he went through the streets in which they lived, on his way to his school, the *Regina Cæli*. The choristers at Eton, the royal and glorious foundation of Henry the Sixth, were to recite the hours of Our Lady every day, after the matins and prime of the feast of the day. The scholars, as soon as they had risen, and whilst making their beds, were to recite the matins of Our Lady, which they were to finish before going to school, and, in the evening, on leaving school, they were to sing an antiphon of Our Lady, with *Ave Maria* and a collect. Before going to supper they said the vespers of Our Lady, according to Sarum use; after vespers, or at another time, as the Provost might appoint, on every day excepting Maundy Thursday and Good Friday, the choristers and scholars, in surplices, were to say a *Pater Noster* before the crucifix on their knees, and then rising, to sing the *Salve* before the image of Our Lady. At the end of the day, all the choristers and scholars before going to bed, were, at the first peal of the curfew bell, to kneel down by their beds; and in their own rooms, and to say alternately the entire hymn, *Salvator Mundi Domine*, and the psalm *Nunc Dimittis*, the antiphon *Salva Nos, Domine, Vigilantes*, with the *Kyrie Eleison, Pater Noster, Ave Maria*, and Creed. And they all were to recite in a loud and intelligible voice the antiphon *Stella Cæli Extirpavit*, with the usual versicle and prayer. There were similar rules for the scholars of Winchester.

It is needless to add that the great English Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were full of observances in honor of the Blessed Virgin. Mr. Waterton tells us a pleasing story of the manner in which the great Alexander of Hales was led to enter the Franciscan Order out of devotion to Our Lady. It appears that he had made a vow never to refuse anything that was asked him in the

name of the Blessed Mother of God. This vow was a secret; but somehow it became known to a certain devout matron, who was very fond both of the Carmelites and Dominicans, and she, with true feminine reticence, communicated it privately to her favorite Friars. She recommended the Carmelites to ask Alexander, then at the height of his fame as a Doctor, to enter their Order for the love of Mary.

"The White Friars are surprised at the thing, considering the man and the elevated station he was in; but relying on the devotion and integrity of the matron, they go to the Doctor, who received them with all the marks of civility imaginable, and they discoursed with him on many heads for a good while, and then returned home, not once, God having so otherwise appointed, so much as remembering the business they came thither for; which the good lady took for an affront, thinking that the omission was an effect of either slight or a misbelief of what she had suggested to them. So she let the Dominicans into the secret, who soon went privately to the Doctor, and first discoursing with him about indifferent matters, that they might at last usher in their address in a more courtly manner, when behold in comes a Friar Minor, with his wallet on his shoulder, having been begging about the town for his brethren, and being now come hither also to beg a little bread, and having fixed his eyes upon the Doctor, as he sat talking to the Dominicans, he simply addressed himself to him in these plain terms: 'Reverend Doctor, you are a very great scholar, and the fame of your virtue is spread far and near. You see the poor Order of the Friars Minor has as yet but few learned men in it, and no Doctors. If you were in it many persons would improve by your means, and therefore I beseech you, for the love of God and the Blessed Virgin Mary, that you will take upon you the habit of our Order, for the good of your soul and for the honor of our institute.' The Dominicans were amazed to see themselves thus prevented, and the Doctor himself at first seemed to be in a consternation, but at last recovering himself, and being inwardly touched with the grace of the Holy Ghost, and taking the words of the simple Brother to be a call from God, he made this reply, 'Go your way, Brother, for I will follow you presently and comply with your request.'"

The sections under which Mr. Waterton classes his liegemen of Our Lady are headed kings, knights and orders of knighthood, shipmen, serjeants at law, authors and printers, and innholders. It must be obvious that this list might have been very largely extended, for we can imagine no reason why the followers of other callings should not have been at least as devout to Our Lady as printers and innholders. We hardly know what Mr. Tennyson would say to the statement of the well-known Juliana Berners, in her treatise of heraldry, that King Arthur laid aside his shield of dragons and crowns, "and took to his arms a cross of silver in a field of verte, and on the right side an image of Our Blessed Lady, her Son in her arms." We may also wonder what the Protestant, not to say unbelieving, knights, who form so large a portion of the members of the most noble Order of the Garter, would think if they were reminded by their sovereign that Our Lady is their chief patroness, and if they were to be called on to practice the injunctions of one of the English kings,—Edward IV.,—"who thought it

necessary that some additional ceremonies within the Order should be observed by himself and the knights and companions to her peculiar honor, and therefore ordained that on her five solemnities the knights companions should annually, as it was wont and accustomed on the yearly Feast of Saint George, wear the peculiar habit of the Order as long as divine service was celebrating, unless they had sufficient cause of excuse, bearing on the right shoulder a golden image of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and further that they should go in the same habit and manner upon all the Sundays in the year, and lastly, that on the same days they, forever, should say five *Pater Nosters* and five *Ave Marias*." But so it was, undoubtedly. All Englishmen, from the king on the throne down to the lowest peasant, layman as well as priests; knights and warriors, as well as Monks and Friars, were penetrated with devotion to the Blessed Mother of God, and on no part of their life, social, political, or military, was the deep impression of this devotion wanting.

The next part of the subject before us naturally passes from persons to things, and we find very interesting details about the various forms in which the devotion of our English ancestors to Mary manifested itself. Churches, organs, bells, wax images, Lady chapels, Loretto chapels, Lady altars, inscriptions, candles, relics, guilds, the sodality, pilgrimages, processions, alms, fasting, the Mary Mass, the Little Office, the Angelus, the beads, the litanies, and other devotions; the consecration to Our Lady of cities, corporations, lands, wells, flowers, furniture; the details of common life, death, and burial, all these heads furnish the industrious writer before us with occasion for producing evidence of the devotion of our forefathers to the Mother of God. The last part of this half of his volume is devoted to a careful account of the English iconography of Our Blessed Lady. The English statues and pictures of Our Lady were remarkable for their beauty. We have here an account of the various manners in which she was represented in her immaculate conception, in her annunciation, in her childbirth, and in her assumption; or as Our Lady of Pity,—the English name for what is called in Italy the *Pietà*—Our Lady of Grace, and Our Lady of Peace. There are also a number of sections about the way in which her statues were colored, robed, crowned, and the like.

The second half of the beautiful volume which we are trying to introduce to our readers is taken up with the long catalogue of shrines and devotions of which we have already spoken. This part is most interesting, as furnishing the practical illustration of the former, which again treats the whole subject in logical order. The illustrations furnished by the second part relate chiefly, as is natural, to the portion of the evidence of English devotion to Our Lady which is to be gathered from an inspection of existing

churches and documents relating to them. We must cull here and there some details which may be of interest to our readers. Loretto chapels may be a puzzle to some.

"For the ghostly comfort of those who wished to go on pilgrimage to Our Lady of Loretto, and were prevented by circumstances, the pious custom arose of erecting in various places chapels which were exact representations of the Holy House, and in which a statue of Our Lady of Loretto was placed in a niche behind the altar. Cuppenberg says the earliest Loretto chapel was erected at Lille by John Lufford, who was attached to the court of Charles V."

There was one of these Loretto chapels at Glastonbury, and another in Scotland, at Musselburg. Here is a story of a Lady chapel at Wroxhall, which is very like the story told in the Roman Breviary about the foundation of the most famous Church of Our Lady in Rome itself, the Church of Saint Mary Major, or Our Lady ad Nives.

"Dame Alice Croft, sometimes nun and lady of this place, poor of earthly goods, but rich of virtues, desired heartily of God and Our Lady that she in her days might see here a chapel of Our Lady. To that intent she prayed ofttime, and on a night there came a voice to her and bade her, in the name of God and Our Lady, begin and perform a chapel of Our Lady. She remembered her thereof and thought it but a dream, and took no heed thereof; but not long. Another night, following, came the same voice to her again, and gave her the same charge more sharply. Still delaying to execute the work, she is visited by Our Lady, who reprimands her: for her neglect, on which she, going to the Prioress and stating that she had only the sum of fifteen pence to commence with, is encouraged to undertake the work, in the trust that Our Lady would increase her store. Then this Dame Alice Croft gave her to prayers, and besought Our Lady to give her knowledge where she should build it and how much she should make it. Then she had by revelation to make it on the north side of the church, and she should find marked the quantity. This was in harvest, between the two Feasts of Our Lady, and on the morrow early she went unto the place assigned her, and there she found a certain ground covered with snow, and all the churchyard else without snow. She, glad of this, had masons ready, and marked out the ground and built the chapel and performed it up. And every Saturday, while it was in building, she would say her prayers in the alleys of the churchyard, and in the plain path she should and did weekly find silver sufficient to pay her workmen and that behoveful to her work, and no more."

Here is another anecdote, in illustration of the pious custom of burning votive candles.

"This pious custom was most common in England. In the year 1225 William, Earl Salisbury, otherwise known as Long Sword, was nearly lost at sea in a violent storm on his return to England. When they were in the utmost despair suddenly a large wax taper, burning with a brilliant light, was seen at the mast-head by all who were thus in danger on board the ship. By the side of the candle they beheld a lady of wondrous beauty standing, who protected the light of the candle, which brilliantly illumined the darkness of the night from the violence of the squall and the heavy downpour of the rain; whereupon from this vision of heavenly brightness the Earl, as well as all the crew, feeling assured of their safety, acknowledged that Divine assistance was with them, and whilst every one on board was ignorant of the portent of this vision Earl William alone attributed the favor of this kindness to the Blessed Virgin Mary, because from the day when he was first girt with the belt of knighthood he had assigned one wax taper before the altar of the Most Blessed Mother of God, which

should burn during the Mass, which was sung every day in honor of the said Mother of God, and during the canonical hours, and thus exchange the temporal for the light eternal."

Mr. Waterton adds that the Earl died the year after his return to England, not without suspicion of poison.

"Feeling his end drawing near he retired to his castle at Salisbury and sent for the Bishop, from whom he received the last Sacraments of the Church and died an edifying death. It happened, continues Wendover, that whilst his body was being carried from his castle to the new church, about a mile distant, for burial, the lighted candles, which were borne, according to custom, with the Cross and Thurible, gave, amidst the heavy rain and gusts of wind, a continued light through the journey, so as to make it clearly evident that the Earl, who had been so penitent, already belonged to the sons of light."

The Mass mentioned in the preceding extract must have been what was commonly called the Mary Mass, that is, a Mass said in honor of Our Lady, always the same, day after day, at her altar. This was, as it seems, the votive Mass of Our Lady, which is now in the Roman missal, and is said to have been composed by the English Alcuin. A priest was maintained in many churches for the special purpose of saying this Mass, who was called the "Seynt Mary Priest." There is frequent mention of this custom in old wills, which contain bequests for his support. In fact, the custom was at one time almost universal. In 1136 mention is made of the Mary Mass at Gloucester, where it was celebrated, as usual, very early in the morning. Within less than a century later, it had become general in all the greater churches in England. Walsingham says that at St. Alban's the Mary Mass was sung with four candles, and a chalice of gold and beautiful vestments; it had been instituted by Abbot William de Trumpington, 1214-1235. At Evesham, twenty-four candles of wax and thirty-three lamps were to be lighted daily, and to burn during the Mary Mass. Early in the reign of Henry the Third St. Mary Mass at St. Paul's, London, is mentioned. There was also a daily Mass of Our Lady in the Tower, and payments to the chaplain for its celebration are mentioned in the Liberate rolls. Both at St. Paul's, at Salisbury, and elsewhere, there were foundations for the Mary Mass. At Ely the customs of Our Lady's altar received all the offerings there, and provided the missal, chalices, vestments, and candles required for the celebration throughout the year. At Magdalen College, Oxford, Waynflete ordained that the second Mass every day should be that of Our Lady after the custom for the Church of Sarum.

This, of course, is a custom which cannot be so easily revived in countries and times when the number of priests is comparatively small; but we cannot help wishing to see something of the kind once more introduced. In the Holy House of Loretto no Mass is

ever said but that of Our Blessed Lady, as at the shrine of St. Peter at Rome, the Mass, we think, of the Octave of the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul is always said.

The mention of the Loretto chapels suggests the subject of pilgrimages in general, another form of devotion of which we fear there is but few opportunities, as yet, in America. But it must be remembered that any altar or statue of Our Blessed Lady, in any church in the world, may be made the object of a devout visit, and that pilgrimages after all are but repeated visits by a large number of devout persons to such altars. The recent partial revival of the practice in France, since the German war, has been occasioned, no doubt, by the wonders wrought at Lourdes, La Salette, and other places. We call it a partial revival, because no one well acquainted with the Catholic countries of the continent of Europe can fail to be aware that the practice has never been extinct. "The pilgrimages of devotion," says Mr. Waterton, "may be divided into two classes: (1) greater ones, to sanctuaries across the sea, or in distant countries; (2) lesser ones, to some sanctuaries nearer home; and these were common to all classes." Then there were also vicarious pilgrimages, made by deputy to sanctuaries both at home and abroad; and these differ from spiritual pilgrimages, often made by religious communities which have inclosure. In the Council of Calne, A.D. 978, it was decreed that it should be lawful for the people to make pilgrimages to St. Mary of Abingdon. Henry the Second, on recovering from a severe illness, went on pilgrimage, as he had vowed, to Our Lady of Roc-Amadour, in 1170, or, according to Robert Dumont, in 1171. Henry the Third visited the sanctuary of Our Lady of Boulogne. Edward the Second went to Our Lady of Boulogne, where he was married. After his victory off Sluys, Edward the Third went on pilgrimage to Our Lady of Ardenburg. Many of the sanctuaries of Our Lady to which pilgrimages were made were little out-of-the-way chapels. Leland records that "not far from Edon Water is a village called Burgham, and there is great pilgrimage to Our Lady." To the little chapel of Our Lady of Caversham there "was great pilgrimage." At Newcastle-on-Tyne, Pilgrim Street still recalls the piety of our ancestors. Near Liskeand, in a wood, there was a chapel of Our Lady, "called Our Lady in the Park, where was wont to be great pilgrimage." At Norwich there was Our Lady at Oke, or of the Oak, so named because her image was placed in an oak tree, a practice which is still so common in Catholic countries. Near Southampton the chapel of Our Lady of Grace was "haunted with pilgrims," whilst "the fane of Southwick stood by the Priory of the Black Canons there, and a pilgrimage to Our Lady." It was by no means unusual, to make a vow of pilgrimage for the recovery of a sick

friend or relative. Thus, on September 28th, 1443, Mrs. Margaret Parton writes to John Parton, saying: "I have behested to go on pilgrimage to Walsingham and St. Leonards for you." When Henry the Sixth was lying ill, the principal members of his court sought leave to make pilgrimages to sanctuaries in foreign countries for his recovery. One of these was John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, whose request the king graciously granted by writ, tested at Westminster on the 14th of August, 1457. Not long after this date the Duke was on pilgrimage at Walsingham, and in the year 1471 the Duke and Duchess together were on pilgrimage to Our Lady of Walsingham on foot.

One of the famous pilgrimages of Our Lady in England was at Ipswich, as to which we have no less authentic a witness than Sir Thomas More. In his dialogue *concerning Heresies* that holy martyr tells us of a miracle that he knew to have been wrought at this shrine. One of the daughters of Sir Roger Wentworth, a girl of the age of twelve, was "in marvellous manner vexed and tormented by our ghostly enemy the devil, her mind alienated and raving, with despising and blasphemy of God, and hatred of all hallowed things, with knowledge and perceiving of the hallowed from the unhallowed, although were she nothing warned thereof." Something moved her to go in pilgrimage to Our Lady of Ipswich. "In the way of which pilgrimage, she prophesied and told many things done and said at the same time in other places, which were proved true, and many things said, lying in her trance, of such wisdom and learning, that right cunning men highly marvelled to hear of so young and unlearned maiden, which she herself wist not what she said, such things uttered and spoken as well learned men might have missed with a long study. And finally being brought and laid before the image of Our Blessed Lady, was there, in the sight of many worshipful people, so grievously tormented, and in face, eyes, look, and countenance, so grizzly changed, with her mouth drawn aside and her eyes laid out upon her cheeks, that it was a terrible sight to behold. And after many marvellous things at the same time shown upon divers persons by the devil, through God's sufferance, as well all the remnant as the maid herself, in the presence of all the company, restored to their good state perfectly cured and suddenly. And in this matter no pretext of begging, no suspicion of feigning, no possibility of counterfeiting, no simpleness in the seers, her father and mother right honorable and rich, sore abashed to see such changes in their children, the witnesses great in number, and many of great worship, wisdom, and good experience, the maid herself too young to feign, and the fashion itself strange for any man to feign, and the end of the matter virtuous, the virgin so moved in her mind with the miracle, that she forth-



with, for aught her father could do, forsook the world and professed Religion in a very good and godly company at the Minories, where she hath lived well and graciously ever since."

Our travels over the ground covered by the volume of which we are speaking are somewhat desultory, and without much connection, save in the general subject to which they all relate. We cannot pass on without a few words about Oxford, where there was a statue of Our Blessed Lady, famed and venerated as having been the statue to which St. Edmund was devout, and on the finger of which he is said to have placed a ring of espousal. The chronicler of Lanercroft says that when he was a boy at Oxford, studying grammar, "he secretly espoused an image of the Glorious Virgin, which we, as well as the whole university, have often seen, by placing on the finger of the Blessed Virgin a ring of gold, which many have since beheld with their own eyes." The common story says that he had two rings made, one of which he kept on his own finger. Another chronicler mentions only one, which was placed by St. Edmund on the finger of Our Lady's image, but which was miraculously found on his own finger when he died. It seems doubtful where this image of Our Lady was. Mr. Waterton thinks that there is evidence that it was in the Church of St. Nicholas, which, after St. Edmund's time, became the Church of the Dominican Fathers. The seal of the Black Friars of Oxford represents Our Lady with Our Lord in her arms, with a little figure kneeling before her, which has been conjectured to represent St. Edmund as a youth.

As we are at Oxford we may as well mention the famous cross which once stood in the quadrangle of Merton College. It seems that in 1126 a Jew insulted a cross which was being carried in procession on Ascension Day, when the chancellor, masters, and scholars of the university were on their way to visit the shrine of Saint Frideswithe, which was afterwards Christ Church. The Jew snatched the cross from its bearer and trampled it under his feet. Prince Edward, who was then in Oxford, informed the King of the outrage, and strict search was made for the offender. He was probably concealed by his Jewish brethren, and the King ordered all the Jews to be imprisoned and a fine cross erected out of their property. It was to be a marble cross of the finest workmanship, with the figure of Our Lord on one side and that of Our Blessed Lady on the other. This arrangement was very common in old wayside crosses. The figure of Our Lady was to have Our Lord in her arms. The whole work was to be finely gilt, and an inscription was to be placed on it relating the occasion of its erection. The Jews were also to present a portable cross of silver gilt, which was to be like those usually borne before archbishops, and was to

be carried before the proctors of the university in their procession. The sheriff found some difficulty in executing the King's orders, as the Jews seem to have had plenty of friends in the city, to whom they made over their property for the nonce, in order to escape the burden which the King imposed upon them. However, the King issued a second writ, ordering the goods of the Jews to be seized wherever they were to be found, and in this manner the money was soon raised. There was some discussion, also, as to the spot on which the cross was to be placed, as the place of the outrage was an inconvenient situation for so large a monument. It was at last placed in the quadrangle of Merton, where it remained till the reign of Henry VI., when it fell to the ground.

But we must not go on forever with our extracts from this fascinating volume. One of the most interesting heads of Mr. Waterton's researches is that of the old prayers and forms of oral devotion to Our Blessed Lady. He claims a great deal for England and Ireland in this respect, for he finds traces of some common forms of this devotion in those countries at a time when they are not known to have existed elsewhere.

"The Irish have a very ancient litany of Our Blessed Lady, which is preserved in the Leabhar-mor, now deposited in the Royal Irish Academy. Professor O'Curry says that it differs in many ways from the litany of Our Lady in other languages, clearly showing that although it may be an imitation, it is not a translation. It is much to be regretted that the learned professor did not add in what languages and where were to be found the litanies of Our Lady of which the Irish litany might have been an imitation. Professor O'Curry believes this litany to be as old at least as the middle of the eighth century. No earlier litany seems to be known; therefore, to the Island of Saints is due the glory of having composed the first litany of their Immaculate Queen. 'The litany of Our Lady,' says Cardinal Wiseman, 'is not a studied prayer, intended to have logical connection in parts, but it is a hymn of admiration and love, composed of a succession of epithets expressive of those feelings, the recital of which is broken into after every phrase by the people or chorus, begging the prayer of her to whom they are so worthily applied. It is a hymn, a song of affectionate admiration, and at the same time of earnest entreaty.'"

The Cardinal then refers to Saint Cyril of Alexandria and says:

"Hear him apostrophize the Blessed Mother of God in the following terms: Hail, Mary, mother of God, venerable treasure of the entire Church, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, sceptre of true doctrine, indissoluble temple, abode of Him who is infinite, mother and virgin. Thou through whom the Holy Trinity is glorified, thou through whom the precious cross is honored, thou through whom heaven exults, thou through whom angels and archangels rejoice, thou through whom evil spirits are put to flight, thou from whom is the oil of gladness, thou through whom over the whole world churches are planted, thou through whom prophets spake, thou through whom apostles preached, thou through whom the dead rise, thou through whom kings reign through the Blessed Trinity."

"Now here," continues the Cardinal, "is a litany not unlike that of Loretto, and we have only to say, '*pray for us,*' after each

of the salutations, to have a very excellent one." This intercalation would surely not spoil nor render less natural or less beautiful that address of the holy patriarch. Hence it appears that whilst these and other homilies suggest the formation of a litany of Our Lady, the Irish were the first who did form a litany, that is, a prayer to Our Lady in the shape of what is now understood by a litany. This old Irish litany of Our Blessed Lady has an indulgence of one hundred days granted to all who recite it by Pius IX. It consists of fifty-eight invocations, from which I have selected the following :

" LITANY.

O Great Mary!	O Destruction of Eve's Disgrace!
O Mary, Greatest of Maries!	O Regeneration of Life!
O Greatest of Women!	O Mother of God!
O Queen of the Angels!	O Mistress of the Tribes!
O Mistress of the Heavens!	O Mother of the Orphans!
O Mother of the Heavenly and Earthly Church!	O Breast of the Infants!
O Gate of Heaven!	O Queen of Life!
	O Ladder of Heaven!

Hear the petition of the poor! Spurn not the wounds and groans of the miserable!"

It could be wished that Mr. Waterton had copied out for us the whole of this ancient litany. In fact, the readers of his work will constantly find themselves regretting that he has not had larger limits allowed him than those of this already large volume, in which he has embodied only the quintessence of his researches.

He makes one remark, in which most will be inclined to agree with him. It is that the old English devotion to Our Lady was essentially joyous. It seems as if our ancestors had the instinct of regarding Mary as especially the cause of our joy.

"The most common and homely of all the Old English Devotions were, The Five Wounds of Our Lord, and Five Joys of Our Blessed Lady. There were, however, several series of Our Lady's Joys—Her Five Joys, Her Seven Earthly and Seven Heavenly Joys, Her Twelve Joys, and Her Fifteen Joys. Lansperg composed a Rosary of the Fifty Joys of Our Lady. I have met with many variations of these joys, and therefore I give only those which were commemorated by our forefathers."

The Five Joys, or as the *Ancient Rationale* calls them, The Five Highest Joys of Our Lady, were the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Assumption. There are many instances found of legacies in honor of these Five Joys, in connection with the Five Wounds of Our Lord. Again, The Seven Earthly Joys of Our Lady were, the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Adoration of the Wise Men, the Finding of Our Lord in the Temple, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Assumption. The Seven Heavenly Joys were, the Surpassing Glory of Our Lady in Heaven, Her Brightness which Fills the whole Heavenly Court,

the Obedience and Honor which She receives from all the Host of Heaven, that Her Divine Son and She have but One Will, that God Rewards at Pleasure all Her Clients Here and Hereafter, that She Sits Next to the Blessed Trinity in Her Glorified Body, and the Certainty that these Joys will Last Forever. Saint Thomas of Canterbury was a great promoter of the devotion to Our Lady's Heavenly Joys. It is sa'd that this devotion was revealed to him, and that he composed the hymn *Gaude, Flore Virginali* in their honor. The Fifteen Joys vary in different lists, and in some of these lists they are made up of the Earthly and the Heavenly Joys, as already given, with the addition either of the Visitation, or of the Crucifixion, as a victory over hell.

Some of the old English hymns in honor of Our Blessed Lady are very beautiful indeed. Here is a simple night hymn :

Upon my ryghte syde Y may ley,  
Blessid lady, to Thee Y prey  
Ffor the teres that ye lete  
Upon your swete Sonny's feete,  
Send me grace for to sleep  
And good dremes for to mete ;  
Slepyng wakyng till to-morrow day be ;  
Our Lord is the Freute, Our Lady is the Tre,  
Blessed be the Blossom that sprang, Ladye, of The,  
*In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Amen.*

The termination of this little hymn reminds us of a custom, which is illustrated by several of the early English hymns and devotions, of mixing Latin and English words together. This custom was very natural when all whq could read could read Latin, and when all were so much more familiar than we are with the hymns and rhythms of the Church. Here is a very beautiful hymn of this sort of the thirteenth century, called "*A Song to Our Ladye.*"

Of all that is so fair and bright,  
*Velut Maris stella,*  
Brighter than the day is light,  
*Parens et puella,*  
I crie to The, Thou see to me,  
Levedy, prey Thy Sone for me,  
*Tam pia,*  
That I mote come to The,  
*Maria.*  
Of care, counseil Thou art best,  
*Felix fecundata*  
Of alle wery Thou art rest,  
*Mater honorata.*  
Bisek him with milde mod  
That for ous alle sad is blod.  
*In cruce,*  
That we moten komen to him  
*In luce.*

Alle this world was forlore  
*Eva peccatrice,*  
 Tyl our Lord was y-bore  
*De te genitrice,*  
 With Ave it went away,  
 Thuster nyth and comet the day  
*Salutis.*  
 The welle springet hut of The,  
*Virtutis.*

Levedy, Flour of alle thing,  
*Rosa sine spina*  
 Thou bere Ihesu Hevene King,  
*Gratia Divina.*  
 Of alle thu berest the pris,  
 Levedy, Quene of Paradys,  
*Electa*  
 Mayde milde, Moder  
*Es effecta.*

Wel He wot He is Thy Sone  
*Ventre quem portasti,*  
 He wyl not werne The Thy bone  
*Parvum quem lactasti*  
 So hende and so God he bis,  
 He havet brout ous to blis  
*Superni*  
 That havet hi-dut the foule put  
*Inferni.*

We may give the following as a modernized version of this hymn:

Of all that is so fair and bright,  
*Velut maris stella,*  
 Brighter than the day is light,  
*Parens et puella,*  
 I cry to Thee, see Thou to me,  
 Lady, pray, Thy Son for me,  
*Tam pia,*  
 That I may come to Thee,  
*Maria!*

Of care Thou art the counsel best,  
*Felix fecundata,*  
 Of all the weary Thou art rest,  
*Mater honorata,*  
 Beseech Thou Him with mild mood  
 That for us did shed His blood  
*In cruce,*  
 That we may come to Him,  
*In luce.*

All this world was forlorn  
*Eva peccatrice,*  
 Until our Lord was born,  
*De te genitrice,*

With Ave it went away,  
Thuster night and cause ter day  
*Salutis,*  
Were all springed out of Thee,  
*Virtutis.*

Levedi, flower of all things,  
*Rosa sine spina,*  
Thou barest Jesus, Heaven's King,  
*Gratia Divina,*  
Of all Thou barest the price,  
Lady, Queen of Paradise,  
*Electa,*  
Maiden, mild; Mother, too,  
*Es effecta.*

Well He wot He is Thy Son,  
*Ventre quem portasti,*  
He will not refuse Thee Thy boon,  
*Parvum quem lactasti,*  
So kind and so good He is;  
He hath taught us to bless,  
*Superni,*  
Sinners of that foulest pit,  
*Inferni.*

Such, then, were some of the hymns of England in the days when the whole of English life was full of Mary. The child's mother commended him to the Queen of Heaven before he was born, and when he came into the world he was dedicated to her. Her name, with that of the sweetest name of Jesus, was on his infant lips, and he was taught to call on her and to have recourse to her as his true mother from his earliest years. Her image, her shrine, her altar, received the homage of his innocent heart. If he went on a journey, he placed himself under her protection. When he went to school he was taught to sing her praises or to worship God in strains in which her name had its place. Her joys, like the sufferings of her Son, were familiar to him. He wore her scapular or had her beads at his girdle. If he entered a guild, it was under her patronage. If he was sick, he promised a pilgrimage to her sanctuary or had a Mass said at her altar. His home, his family, his work, his going out and coming in, were consecrated by devotion to her. He knew her Little Office, the psalms which form her name, and her antiphons, and a score of other forms of invoking or honoring her. He placed his life and death under her care and charge, her name was on his lips when he breathed his last, and the very bell which tolled for his soul was dedicated to her. And so he was a true child of faith, he lived in the familiar thought of what her Son had done for him, and the

heaven to which he looked forward was not a strange country to him.

Nowhere, either in the Old World or the New, can the Catholic faith live and flourish without the solid devotion to Mary which is the natural and inevitable fruit of a true belief in the incarnation of the Son of God. It would be foolish to speak as if this devotion were wanting in any country which belongs to Catholic Christendom. But there may be atmospheres in which faith cannot be as joyous, as free, as exulting, and as demonstrative as elsewhere, and it would be foolish also to undervalue the influence of a devotion which is able to mark itself on every detail of life instead of lying hid in the heart of the people in which it prevails. The joyousness of England went away from her shores at the Reformation, and it is the joyousness of faith which is one of the special fruits of a deep overpowering devotion to the Mother of God. The book before us gives many a hint as to the way in which this joyousness was fostered by our ancestors, and this is one main reason why we desire to see its teaching made familiar to English-speaking Catholics in the new hemisphere as well as in the old.

---

## NEWSPAPERS AND NOVELS.

**M**ENTAL activity is commonly believed to specially characterize our age. If reasons for this belief are demanded, the inquirer is pointed to the facts that in every department of human knowledge, investigation, and research are prosecuted with untiring energy; that these departments in modern times have greatly increased in number; and that the field and scope of each of them have been greatly enlarged. On these grounds it is commonly held that the educated classes of to-day are intellectually far superior to those of past times.

Without entering into any lengthy discussion of this conclusion, we affirm that it is faulty in that it represents only one side of the question. If the number of individuals who possess a respectable amount of knowledge be taken as a rule for measuring the intellectual progress of a period, and if the word knowledge is taken in the broad and liberal sense now commonly attached to it, then it must be admitted that the present age is greatly in advance of all previous times. But quantity is not the only element that should be taken into account in the calculation. Quality also enters into it,

and giving quality its due value we will be brought to a very different result from the conclusion just referred to.

We readily concede to the second half of the nineteenth century almost unparalleled intellectual activity, but at the same time we maintain, paradoxical though it may seem, that this activity is combined with a lassitude of thought which also is unparalleled.

This statement perhaps will be startling to some, and elicit only a smile of utter incredulity from others, yet it is not difficult of proof.

The literary world, that with which we are now concerned, is made up of two classes, those who write and those who read. In past times the student who represented the latter class was not less an intellectual worker than was the author who represented the former. But at present it may be laid down as a rule, having but few exceptions, that only the writers work mentally.

The great mass of the reading public has sunk into an almost hopeless intellectual "*dolce far niente*." There is no room to doubt that reading nowadays seems productive of drowsiness of mind, a torpor of the mental faculties, manifesting itself in widespread mental indolence. Thus, our age presents the unique spectacle of a union of strongly contrasted extremes of the greatest intellectual activity and of the greatest intellectual inertia; action and energy on one side, and the stagnation of habitual laziness on the other.

An obvious reason for this state of things suggests itself, namely, the enormous increase in the number of literary productions and the comparative ease with which they can be procured. The amount and variety of reading matter devoured by individuals in our times precludes the possibility of thoroughly digesting it, and prevents the nutritive and stimulating effect upon the thinking faculties which a more moderate supply of less heterogeneous matter would produce. Then, too, the relation between reader and writer has undergone a change, or rather an additional relation has sprung up between them. Conscious of the incapacity of most readers to form intelligent judgments upon or draw logical conclusions from what they read, writers accommodate themselves to this inertness of thought. As for the reader, if he encounters a problem which requires close thought to enable him to understand it thoroughly, in nine cases out of ten the consideration of the problem will be deferred until some writer or other has obligingly relieved him of all necessity of mental labor by formulating a solution for him.

"Labor-saving" machines, as we all know, abound in our times. We believe that modern writers might be styled not unaptly "thought-saving" machines; for that is, in fact, the office which, to a very great extent, they perform for the reading pub-



lic. They condense facts, weigh evidence, arrange ideas, criticize, judge, and point out the sequences of cause and effect in the great strife of thought, and furnish convenient superficial summaries of the intellectual movements of the day for those who are themselves either unable or unwilling to study those movements.

The ancient maxim that "knowledge is power" was never before so universally accepted as true, nor so generally acted on, as now. The necessity of possessing a certain amount of knowledge for the practical discharge of the duties of life has helped to ingraft this maxim deeply on our age. Besides this, there is an almost universal pretension and desire to be ranked amongst the educated classes of society, together with an unceasing effort to bestow upon the greatest possible number the boon of education. The result of the combined working of these several factors is a general anxiety for knowledge. But notwithstanding this, we here repeat that before we can determine upon the claim of our age to supreme mental advancement we must make a qualitative as well as a quantitative analysis, that is to say, we must extend our inquiry and direct our attention upon two points, viz., the number of literary productions, and, going hand in hand with this, a higher standard of thought and style.

In regard to the first point, it would argue either gross ignorance or gross want of candor did we fail to note as distinguishing our age the increased number of instrumentalities by means of which information on every subject is gathered, and of channels through which it is diffused. A stream of printed matter, immense in volume, pours forth incessantly upon the world, the greater portion of which consists of the lighter kinds of literature. For the sake of greater clearness and definiteness in our remarks we may divide this literature into five classes.

First in order we place what is commonly called the newspaper press. The daily and weekly journals, whose readers number in the aggregate millions beyond computation, have—it is hardly necessary to remark—grown into a necessity of life, like tobacco and tea, and sugar and coffee. We dismiss them now, however, that we may refer to them later on. The next class is a motley crowd. It comprises all the serial and periodical publications, magazines, reviews, etc., with contents of a most heterogeneous character, promiscuously *mixed up*. Poetry, fiction, essays, reviews of books, novels in chapters, are interspersed here and there with a smattering of heavier matter, such as treatises on religion, sociology, mathematics, physics, and metaphysics. Many are eclectic in character, and are the *vade-mecum* of the "*habitués*" of literature. They are, in truth, indispensable to all who wish to keep *au fait* with the literary world, and they meet a want which the vastness

and variety of literary productions has necessarily created, and which a single individual could never supply without their aid. Third in order comes the incessant avalanche of novels. These, good, bad, and indifferent, are the pabulum on which the modern mind loves to feed, and hence the important part they play as agents of culture and civilization. A great falling off in numbers is noticeable in the next class, which consists of travels, explorations, biographies, and works on history, religion, politics, national economy, and that much contested battle-ground, philosophy. In this class too is comprehended polemic and controversial literature, which furnishes also a large amount of material for the second class. The rear of the procession is brought up by republications and translations of the standard classics of all times and of all nations. The publications belonging to this fifth class are, we regret to say, purchased by many rather because they are considered indispensable to a library than with any intention of reading and re-reading them until the golden treasures of their thought become fully known and appreciated. This is the picture we find ourselves compelled to paint of contemporary literature.

To the first and third class of our division belongs the distinction of having obtained the largest number of readers, and to these two classes, therefore, we shall confine our remarks in this paper.

The indifference and want of discrimination people generally exhibit in regard to what they read, strangely contrasts with the care shown in other occupations. If a person proposes to set out on a tour through distant countries, the moment the intention has ripened into resolution he commences to make preparations for it. Maps and guide-books are consulted, the route is carefully laid out, inquiry made as to the comfort and safety of railroads and steamship lines, their arrival and departure; the hotels at the stopping-places are decided upon—an investigation in which more experienced friends, who are acquainted with the localities to be visited, assist with their knowledge and advice; in short, every possible precaution is taken to insure the success of the trip. The details of the arrangements will vary, of course, according to the length of time the traveller has at his disposal, the distance to be traversed, the depth of his purse, and his station in life. But as a rule no one travels without previous preparation. Yet the same person, whose preliminary steps for a tour we have outlined, walks into a bookstore, selects at random some recent publication, or trusts entirely to the recommendation of a clerk or a eulogistic notice in a newspaper. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that the vast majority read without system, without purpose, without discrimination. We do not mean to imply that there are none

who read with aim and method and judgment ; for such there are. But their number is only a trifling percentage of the reading public ; they form, indeed, an almost infinitesimal fragment of the vast society of readers. The dictates of reason and common sense seem to have no influence or power when people engage in a pursuit so unimportant as "reading." The world seems to take for granted that the step from reading nothing to reading something denotes a great intellectual advance, and that it is therefore immaterial what is read, since it cannot fail to result ultimately in benefiting the reader. These remarks may seem ill-tempered and too sweeping to some, but unless the truth which they express is admitted it is impossible to explain intelligibly the conduct of a large portion of the reading public.

But let us return to the subject of newspapers. Between newspapers and newspapers there is as much difference as there is between an excellent saddle of mutton, well cooked, tender, juicy, delicious to the palate, and a tough sinewy steak cut from an animal of prehistoric times. So with newspapers. From the highest, type of a good paper, for instance, the *London Times*, to the lowest, such as the Nihilistic organ, *Land and Liberty*, we pass through innumerable gradations of excellence until we reach those in which a microscopic inspection even, fails, to discover an intelligible reason for their existence. Let us analyze the process of newspaper-reading as it is prosecuted by civilized Christendom. In our description we follow in the main an astute observer of human nature, whose name, however, we are unable to rescue from oblivion. After the paper is obtained, the attention is first directed to the telegrams. But it would be erroneous to presume that anxiety about affairs of gravity occurring throughout the world is the motive. It is done for no better reason than because a habit has been acquired of wishing to be fed with the latest intelligence. A craving for news, like any other craving, once contracted must be satisfied. For this reason, then, all the telegraph news, home and foreign, great and small, is read with an equal amount of interest and an equal lack of reflection. After this the leading articles are turned to. The fate they meet is best described by saying "they are read;" for it must not be imagined that any concern is felt whether their contents are true or false, exaggerated or misrepresented. The eye runs over them to catch the general drift of what is written. Exceptions are made only in favor of anecdotes or really quite startling paragraphs, which are intrusted to memory for the sake of using them to create a sensation. Next comes, probably, the home and foreign correspondence, which is glanced over in the same way. There is probably a letter from Paris and one from London or from New York, each as likely to

have been written by some obscure scribe in the garret of a cheap boarding-house as received by mail. But the spiciness of the one is sure to be properly balanced by the dulness of the other, while both teem with a multitude of topics. Then follow divers articles, perhaps on Mr. Férry's education bill in France, or on the Zulu war, a brilliant account of the marriage or the funeral of some "great personage," or of a railroad disaster, described in such a graphic way that one either regrets not to have been present or feels his hair stand on end with horror. The local news column follows next in order, and then come sporting intelligence, law reports, shipping news, weather and money market. When the paper is put down an inconceivable variety of information has been jostled in a disorderly manner through the reader's mind, and the conclusion is generally drawn: "Nothing in the papers to-day."

We think this is as fair an account of average newspaper reading as can be rendered. The evening journals are skimmed over in similar style, only with this difference, that due allowance is made in the amount of attention bestowed upon them for the wear and tear on the brain of a whole day's work. Aware of this, the afternoon papers, as a rule, are the "*ne plus ultra*" of brevity and condensation. And here the fact must be recorded, that many fairly well-educated persons have fallen slaves to so slovenly a habit of reading. We have extant in our days large numbers of "confirmed newspaper-readers." All those who devote whatever spare time they can secure to skimming over a morning paper in the morning and an evening paper in the evening, with, perhaps, a weekly or two and a monthly on Sundays and at other leisure times, all these belong to one family, the family of "confirmed newspaper-readers." Excessive devotion to newspapers prevails mainly among men; but in our opinion, it is productive of the same evil effects that undue devotion to novels produces on females. News-reading does not promote a healthy mental condition; on the contrary, an individual that reads habitually in the above-described manner destroys by degrees his brain-power. The judgment will become weakened, the sense of mental discrimination blunted, intellectual initiative discouraged, and the mental powers finally become deadened, or at least seriously impaired by substituting a habit of mechanical skimming for that of intellectual reading. The influence of the press on the class of confirmed readers, as we have styled them, consequently denotes no real intellectual advancement. For, while a person who is not reading may be thinking, one who is engaged in mechanical reading is almost sure not to think. We have been speaking here of the better educated classes of society. If we descend a few steps on the social ladder, we encounter a state of

affairs still more discouraging in its character. The laboring classes, but a few generations ago, could not be counted as forming an integral part of the educated world. The laboring classes of to-day, with the exception, perhaps, of some rural districts where the much-vaunted benefits of a liberal education have not as yet gained a strong foothold, are now mostly habitual readers. Scanty means and a limited amount of time, which is all they can devote to mental culture, narrows down for them the field of reading matter. In the majority of cases a cheap newspaper is at once the Alpha and the Omega of intellectual food. They read not like those whose station in life is less humble, but they plod their way through from beginning to end, not omitting even the advertisements. Besides, the papers especially destined for the laborer have not that wide scope, nor that diversity of matter which first-class papers display. The articles are written so as to be within the understanding of the readers for whom they are intended, and a large space is generally devoted to a discussion of their own grievances and misfortunes, coupled with suggestions often very ill-judged, for the amelioration of their condition. They are, in fact, political levers, used alike by ambitious candidates for office, who court popularity in order to secure votes, and by unscrupulous schemers, to secure their goodwill under the pretence of having in view the improvement of their condition, but really to use them for their own selfish purposes.

The public dangers of our times, the social discontentment, the political corruption, the almost entire loss of correct judgment, the absence of the principles of morality, and the utter destruction of faith form an array of facts that must be ascribed to the pernicious effects produced by the circulation of cheap and bad newspaper organs among the masses. A few men without principles, or, what is worse still, and yet oftener the case, a few men with bad principles, acquire by means of cheap "laborers' journals" the direction of the intellect, of the will, nay, of the man himself. If in a state like Germany the suppression of over three hundred papers of Socialistic tendencies became a necessity, it was because the authority which is vested in every government could not allow the further corruption of its subjects. Could any stronger illustration be required to illustrate the detrimental influence of a large portion of the newspaper press upon society? If so, we refer to the reign of terror in Russia. Unless it be a progress from barbarism to civilization to advocate murder and assassination, unless it be an intellectual advance to have one's life threatened in print for being an officer of the crown, unless bloodshed and incendiarism, crime and rapine be the heralds of civilization, unless this be so, the Nihilistic press merits unqualified condemnation.

It may be argued against us that we have painted our picture darker than the reality and that we are blind to the benefits conferred upon mankind by the institution called "the press." This is not the case. We gladly acknowledge real merits when we find them. And so we hesitate not to say that a large number of our journals deserve high praise. But if the evils produced are not counterbalanced by the advantages accruing from the existence of an institution; if it is not to be denied, as it cannot be denied in these days, that the mischief wrought by the corrupt portion of venal newspapers is far beyond the control and influence not only of the uncorrupted press, but also almost beyond the control of national governments and of civilized society, how can it be asserted by people who think that the institution which is the cause of such a state of things, or, if not the first cause, is at least indisputably the agent without which the evils referred to could not have been spread to such an appalling extent, how can it be asserted that the universal prevalence of a habit of indiscriminate unreflective reading is evidence of the intellectual advancement claimed for our age?

The question is one of profit and loss, and is, simply, which has been the greater, the influence of the press for evil or its influence for good? To this question the answer is furnished by facts of such gravity that there can be no room for doubt as to what the answer should be.

On the branch of literature next in importance women chiefly waste their time. When the art of reading and writing and the rudimentary elements of arithmetic have been mastered, the novel becomes a staple article and an inseparable companion of the young female. It is true, novels figure in many domestic circles only as contraband and are read under prohibition. But this only shows, first, that parents sometimes possess common sense enough to conclude that such reading is not conducive to the healthful formation and development of character; and, in the second place, it exhibits the attractive power of these works of fiction. Not unfrequently trashy novels become almost the sole means of education. How very desirable, therefore, it would be to find in them material for real mental culture need not be dwelt upon here. Standard novels, such as might be put into the hands of the young without scruple or fear, can easily be counted. From that fact we may infer how very small their number is. Worthless trash, on the other hand, abounds. Fully three-fourths, if not more, of the publications under this head, have effects upon the intellect akin to those of newspapers. This class of novels, too, stimulates a morbid self-consciousness; the mind is filled with utterly absurd ideas about love and friendship, society and parental authority, and unrestrained

freedom and liberty of action. The religious element is rather avoided than brought forward, and what religious principles do fall under discussion, or are insinuated, are far more apt to undermine the faith instilled into the child's heart by the instruction of an anxious mother than to strengthen and fortify that faith. As to morality, the morality inculcated in these productions is generally of a most questionable character; for, the youthful mind imbibes from their pages certain notions that unlawful attachments are affiliated with depth of feeling and loftiness of character; and thoughts are generated which shrink from light until a ruined life and an irredeemable past, too late, betray their existence. Virtuous principles, checked in their harmonious development, wither away under the influence of this continuous novel-reading, until at last the distinction between right and wrong grows obscure. Thus not only is intellectual confusion created, but morality is destroyed by impressing false principles upon the young as the true principles of action. "To love and to err is but human." Such maxims are mild specimens of the sort of morality infiltrated by that curse of the age, "indiscriminate novel-reading." Poison, though sweetened by a liberal admixture of sugar, though attractive in form, though affording a momentary relief from the monotonous routine of an uneventful life, is poison nevertheless, and in the great majority of instances novels contain this poison in disguise. And yet how few trashy novels issue from the press without receiving words of praise and commendation from our newspaper press? And how few, too, are the instances in which merited censure is administered! Here, however, the materialistic tendency of our age asserts itself. The interest of the publisher and bookseller and the interest of the newspaper book reviewer here coincide. There are—and we take great pleasure in stating it—many men of character and of conscience among literary critics, men not only capable in the highest degree of forming an opinion and passing a sound judgment, but also morally incapable of giving any other than an honest one. To them we gladly render their due meed of honor. But, unfortunately, they are few. Author, publisher, bookseller are willing to pay for the favorable comments of the press; the press, in turn, is profited by conveying first to the public the tidings that So-and-so's long-expected sensational story has at last appeared and surpasses the most sanguine anticipations. Some papers are too high-toned; some affect, at least, to be too high-toned to sell their criticisms. The person whose doleful business it is to wade through all the new publications, and to whom the *reviewing* of the inevitable trash is intrusted, may refuse the direct bribe of money, to which the penny-a-liner is open. But the author, whose interest is united closely with the publishers', or very often the publishers

themselves, resort to other effective means at their disposal to secure a favorable notice from the well-known critic. Thus even the most trashy and pernicious novels rarely fail to receive laudatory notices. Moreover, it is much more agreeable to praise than to condemn; much more advantageous to make friends than to raise up enemies. Then, too, public opinion is shirked. A book which deserves, it may be, nothing but censure, but which, owing to a vitiated taste has been favorably received by the novel-reading public, few critics will have the courage to condemn as it deserves and as they would if they dared. In such cases the majority of our newspaper critics will prefer "unlimited discretion" (*sic*) to truthfulness, and from *prudential* motives will abstain from obtruding their own candid estimate of the value of the book, or rather of its worthlessness, upon the unwilling ear of the public.

Thus far in our remarks we have had reference mainly to that portion of the literature of fiction which supplies the demands of the middle and lower classes and obtains its support from them.

Novels are works of fiction. As works of art they may, from an artistic standpoint, possess a meritorious character. They may be excellent in that one particular, though faulty in every other point of view. But novels, after all, fall, like sculpture and painting, and poetry, also, under the requirements of ethics. Apart from the æsthetic, they ought to have a didactic side. In a novel, the purposes of the drama should be enlarged. Therefore, unless a novel aims at the purification of the human mind from the bondage of passion; unless it tries, as its ultimate end, to bring the true, the good, and the beautiful into prominence; unless it engenders in the reader love for virtue, and hatred and abhorrence of vice, it fails as a novel.

The field in which the novel moves is so large that there should exist no lack of means to keep this main constituent of excellence constantly in view. Dramatic and pathetic elements can blend in it with enchanting descriptions of nature. Yet, brief, unimpressive melodramatic scenes are too frequently introduced, which mar the even tenor of the story. Wearisome digressions, superfluous explanations, reflections which have neither depth nor meaning, often incumber an otherwise charming tale. An infusion of spirit is certainly desirable; but the sensational element ought never to overshadow the plot. The principal use of the dialogue ought to be restricted to certain definite ends, to bringing out the phases of character, to preparing the way for the incidents, and to foreshadowing the final catastrophe. In the dialogue there is wide room for the exhibition of art and skill and true discretion; for the tamer form of narrative needs interruption, and it increases the interest if persons tell their own tale, while the purpose of the con-



versation is gradually revealed to the reader as event follows event. But the talking must not degenerate into verbiage, while, at the same time, it should be sufficiently copious and discursive to be natural. The plot is not seldom a structure resting upon supports so fragile that the failure of one entails a collapse of the whole fabric. As a public road is often embellished and enlivened by flowers and foliage along the wayside, so the course of a tale ought to be embellished and enlivened by graceful descriptions and amusing or entertaining dissertations. The characters ought to be conceptions faithfully and consistently carried out on all sides.

These are some of the requirements of a good novel. Hence to produce a real work of art in this line of fiction requires more than a ready pen and felicitous expressions, than charm of style and mastery of language, than a lively imagination and a happy faculty of combination. The historical novel, moreover, undertakes to sketch the inner life of a period of the events of which history presents us with a formal account. Manners and customs, tastes and pleasures, estimable traits of character and glaring defects alike require careful treatment. They call therefore for elaborate studies.

Now let us ask candidly, who and what is the average novelist? Excepting those who stand at the head of the profession and whose works are a living protest against the tendency of modern literature to deterioration, the average novelist, he or she, is generally one who has failed in other fields, or who resorts to novel-writing for a livelihood. The demand for novels is so great that even a very inferior article commands some price. Money to this class of writers is the first object, and it is more easily obtained by turning out trashy novels by the ream, after a general pattern, than by earnest study. Thus men and women become novelists regardless whether or not they bring the necessary gifts and qualifications to their selected vocation. Aided and abetted by a venal press in the undertaking, they inundate the book market with novels, the quality of which is in inverse proportion to the quantity. Without genius, without talent, without ability, without either inspiration or real vocation, stern necessity, or a mere mercenary motive, incites to attempt success by the pen. So far as the effect concerns merely the purse, the result may often surpass expectation; but so far as "letters" are concerned, the attempt, as a general rule, neither secures literary laurels nor does it elevate the standard of excellence. When we consider the almost fabulous amount of work performed by some writers, simply as regards the manual labor on the manuscript, and when we further consider what frightful racking of the brain it must cost to avoid repetition in construction and to give each story a distinctive character of its own, we are not much surprised that a large portion of the novels

of our day is characterized by monotonous triviality, a slow dragging along, an utter absence of fresh spirit, and an evidently exhausted imagination. One must feel commiseration for those poor novelists; for there is nothing more dreary and difficult, more wearing than compulsory literary work. When persons decide upon engaging in such work they cast their lot in an evil hour; for having once entered the arena, retreat is all but impossible, while the toil and labor and wear and tear both of mind and body are immensely out of all proportion to the scanty returns made by shrewd publishers to second and third rate authors.

Much of what we have said in regard to novelists applies also to newspaper-men. The qualifications of an able editor are possessed by few. To a versatility of mind seldom met with, he must unite that rare quality of turning out a well-written leader at a moment's notice on almost every subject that may present itself. Then, besides the editor's other positions on the staff of good newspapers involve heavy responsibilities and require mental and physical exertions which tax strength and endurance severely. Many who occupy these positions are quite prominent writers, some of them distinguished; and unquestionably they sometimes render very important services to the public. But we are not referring to these, and when we leave the "*Dei majores*" we mix among a crowd of quite disreputable characters. It is a corps at once subservient and impudent, ignorant and yet full of conceit, seldom thoroughly acquainted with any branch of learning, yet flourishing a multitudinous knowledge as shallow as it is pretentious. Their ignorance is concealed or attempted to be concealed under a bombastic and exaggerated style. The average newspaper man has one wonderful talent, that is, the ability to write palpable nonsense without exertion of the brain; writing with him has become by dint of practice a mechanical rather than an intellectual occupation. Can he be ranked amongst the "men of letters"?

The conclusions we deduce from the foregoing considerations obviously cannot go towards making up a favorable verdict for either of the two lines of modern literature we have discussed.

It is well here to bear in mind that literature reflects indirectly, but truly, the character of an age. Moreover, literature is more than the mere expression of contemporaneous thought. As we have already observed, the literature of a given period acts as a silent but powerful agent in the formation of the character of the period that follows. Fancy and imagination issue from the human brain, and in their flight arrest the will and determine the conduct of countless individuals. They give to an age their own characteristics. The visible imprint left by an age in its literature, which is handed down to posterity, establishes therefore a more than for-

tuitous connection between two generations. Literature is a guide, so to speak, into a land beyond our own immediate horizon. And so the two branches of *modern literature* which we have examined will throw a light upon our own times, and also upon the near future that is already dawning upon us.

Burke asserts, that "the cause of a wrong taste is defective judgment." We fully agree with him, because, in the face of all contradiction we maintain, that the circulation of bad newspapers and bad novels would not have assumed the immense proportions of our day without gross defect of judgment on the part of the public. But while we find the primary cause of this in the want of a proper discrimination on the part of the reading public, it is not to be doubted that the vast quantity of very mediocre reading matter exerts a reflex influence, and produces defective judgment in those who devour it. A striking similarity, it seems to us, exists between the usefulness of alcoholic drinks and the usefulness of newspapers and novels; and in the discussion of the temperance question the arguments *pro* and *contra* have elicited a like confusion to that which exists in regard to the question before us. It is certainly going too far to regret the existence of wines, beers, and liquors, because they have filled inebriate asylums, or because intoxication, a sure effect of their immoderate use, often leads to crime. Stimulants in certain cases are highly beneficial when moderately used, and in certain climates and in certain conditions of life they are indispensable necessities. The highest authorities of the medical faculty sustain this opinion. In like manner, we hold on solid grounds that the extent to which the readers of our times indulge in newspapers and novels tends to promote an unhealthy condition of mental culture. We here simply state a deplorable fact, but we by no means pass a sweeping condemnation on the progress which we have maintained is apparent in the present age. The temperance question is analogous to the one we are treating. It is an extreme view to see in total abstinence the only remedy for excess. What is required is to abstain from *immoderate* use in one case, and from *indiscriminate* reading in the other. Here we must meet an objection which will be raised. Pope says:

" 'Tis with our judgments as our watches, none  
Go just alike, yet each believes his own."

He strikes here at the very root of the difficulty; for the reliance placed upon our own private opinions, a belief in a certain private infallibility, whatever matters are dealt with, where our inclinations lean powerfully all one way,—this, we contend, is the great error. On the other hand, were we to grant the absence of all authority in

the walks of private life, and to assume private infallibility, we would find ourselves before a mountain, the steep sides of which it is impossible to climb, while its solid rock defies digging away. There is, indeed, a way to avoid the dilemma and to solve the problem. As Jenyns says,

“ But have we then no laws besides our will,  
No just criterion fix'd to good or ill ?  
As well at noon we may obstruct our sight,  
Then doubt if such a thing exists as light.”

We come now upon exceedingly delicate ground ; for we touch the important questions of religion and of education. Faith and morality cannot be separated. Where the former is missing, the latter will die out ; and where the former is established, the latter will at once appear. Immorality indicates, without fail, absence of religion. Nor have moral obligations, indeed, any value, if the future life is called in question ; their value, where that is done, at best can have only an ephemeral character. We all know that the foundation of morality can alone be laid and must be laid in youth, in the tender age of childhood. It is, therefore, in the schools that correct moral principles ought to be ingrafted upon the children, for the school in a certain sense is their church, as the Church in turn is the school of the parents. These two great truths are frightfully ignored in our days. The elimination of religion from the education of the masses has been and is still prosecuted by the erection of undenominational schools, though these schools are the only ones the children of the poor can attend. No wonder that under these circumstances we notice an entire absence of correct principles as to right and wrong ; no wonder young people who grow up in these modern schools display bad taste in their reading ; no wonder they think right wrong, and wrong right. Temperance is not brought about by the conversion of the confirmed drunkard, but by instilling habits of self-restraint and moderation into the young, and by carefully training them during the period of adolescence. We do not mean to imply that it is not a noble undertaking to rescue those who become fatally addicted to intemperance from ruin ; far from it. We assert merely that the one method is radically and thoroughly effective in that it prevents the disease, while the other simply prevents a fatal termination in individual instances. And so it is with children. Obedience to the injunctions of parents and of those who are in authority over them can be enforced for a time, but this obedience without religion will ever be slavish submission. No wonder, we repeat again, prohibited books are read on the sly ; no wonder mischievous literature is

exerting so widespread and so pernicious an influence; no wonder the public taste descends lower and lower.

It is not within the scope of this paper to dwell upon the mission of the Catholic press, with which we are brought face to face. Nor do we intend to extol the "*index librorum prohibitorum*," issued by the one institution which alone has ever claimed the right of superintending the mental culture of her children, the Church of Rome. We leave to abler pens to take up these subjects. We have merely touched them, and we are conscious that in doing so we have been going to a length that many, perhaps, even of Catholics, will not follow us. We lay down only a principle, and we claim that if true Catholic ideas—and we do not mean by them the narrowmindedness freely attributed to Catholics—were breathed throughout the world, it would soon find to its surprise, as well as joy, great relief from two fatal evils,—demoralizing newspapers and novels, and drunkenness. For, we believe that if people are firmly grounded while young in right principles of faith and morality, and that if they hold fast to them, as they will if they attend to the duties imposed by the Church upon them, that in that case the harm wrought by bad literature will be greatly lessened, if not entirely prevented. An undue appetite kept in bounds may now and then break loose, but as the body tries to cast off external objects that accidentally enter and injure it, so the poisonous doctrines of false morality propagated by trashy papers and trashy novels will find no room or scope in a healthy moral atmosphere. If neither bad papers nor bad novels were any longer in demand, their supply would stop; and both these branches of literature could and would rise to a higher plane, and leave the decision not doubtful as to whether we surpass our ancestors in intellectual culture or not. In conclusion we add that it would be well for hyper-rigid moralists to bear in mind the classic truism.

"*Medium tenuere beati.*"

---

## BEZA AS A TRANSLATOR: HIS PERVERSIONS OF THE WORD OF GOD.

*The Holy Bible, According to the Authorized Version* (A. D. 1611). With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New Testament, Vol. I., St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1878. Royal 8vo.

*H Kainη Διαθήκη* α. τ. λ. Novum Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi Graeco-Latinum, Theodoro Beza interprete. Tiguri (ex typographeo Bodmeriano), 1671.

IN preparing the way to treat of the corruptions or deliberate mistranslations that disfigure all English Bibles outside of the Church, it was impossible to omit mention of the great "Reformer"<sup>1</sup> of Wittemberg. He was the immediate founder of the school of modern heretical mistranslation, though only virtually the inventor of the new exegesis, which seeks to destroy the Bible under pretext of investigating its meaning. And in a former article we have laid before our readers sufficient evidence, not only from his practice but also from his avowed principles, that he considered it his *right* to treat the Word of God as suited his humor or the interests of his theological system, omitting, altering, or adding to its words and falsifying its sense. To the examples alleged might have been added a hundred others.

But there is another great "Reformer" and propagator of the New Gospel, who must on no account be overlooked; for he was a master in this wicked art of mistranslation, and his influence on

<sup>1</sup> A Protestant divine has lately cautioned his brethren to avoid the use of the words "Reformation" and "Reformers," in their controversial dealings with Catholics. And his reason is that the latter, if they are conscientiously attached to their belief, must resent any imputation that it could have been *reformed*, that is, changed for the better. The advice was given, no doubt, with kindly, charitable intent, and we thank the author for it. But Catholics have so long heard these words that they have become indifferent to them, and have themselves no scruple to use them in their technical sense, as indicating individuals or an epoch, without going behind this outward meaning. They use them, so to speak, with quotation marks, either expressed or understood. We rather think the word has its advantages for those who are disposed to reflect seriously. Its latent blasphemy will soon be made plain to whoever soberly investigates its full force of meaning. It virtually says that the work of the Divine Architect and his inspired Apostles was clumsy patchwork, needing human repairs to prevent it from falling to pieces. What is this but to deny God's wisdom or God's power? The human element in the Church is in perpetual need of reformation or improvement, and will so remain to the day of judgment. But the divine element, the body of doctrine and morals bequeathed by Christ to His Church, of its nature, and further by divine promise, is irreformable, and the system which pretends to reform His work carries its absurdity with it in its very name.

the labors of English heterodox interpreters was perhaps far greater than that of Luther. We mean Theodore Beza. And to understand the career of this reforming Bible-interpreter, some idea of his early life is necessary. In the gay and reckless youth who showed himself now and then in the law-schools of Orleans, or in the fashionable fop whose amours formed the gossip of Parisian society towards the close of the first half of the sixteenth century,<sup>1</sup> none of his associates would have recognized the future friend and successor of the prophet of Geneva, the religious politician who was one day to figure in scenes of conspiracy and bloody war, the astute theologian who was to prop up the most revolting features of Calvinism by gloss and commentary and, when needed, by mis-translation and perversion of God's Holy Word. The law-studies of the embryo jurist were the veriest sham. Not Minerva and Themis, but Venus and Flora were his tutelary deities. He turned aside with abhorrence from the dreary pages<sup>2</sup> of Bartolo and Baldo, and found more genial sources of inspiration in the licentious muse of Catullus and Martial. His series of poems begun in Orleans and continued at Paris, in imitation of such models, reflects more perhaps of their lubricity than of their poetic coloring; and we can only smile at the apology or evasion afterwards used by the grave theologian of fifty to account for the sins of his youth. He says that, though he was pained by the moral filth of those old poets, and therefore compelled to read them with half-averted eyes, yet his incautious admiration of their wit and elegance induced him to do his best to resemble them in style;<sup>3</sup> which excuse the Anglican biographer of Calvin disposes of with this brief comment: "A fine piece of prudish hypocrisy!"<sup>4</sup> What would Mr. Dyer have said had he adverted to another excuse given in the same preface, in which Beza prétends that while composing these loose poems he did not understand what he was writing about, because of his tender age!<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Beza's course of study in Orleans extended from the fifteenth to the twentieth year of his age (1534-39); his sojourn in Paris from that year to his twenty-ninth (1539-48), in which he fled to Geneva.

<sup>2</sup> This same thought he expressed by a happily-coined word, when living some years amid the gayeties of Parisian life, in a letter to his friend Pomponius Macutus (Pompon Maclot), "*Mihi quidem nunquam libebit ~~begetolobezadizun~~.*"

<sup>3</sup> Beza's words are taken from his preface to the second edition of his poems, published by Stephanus, in 1569: "*Etsi enim, quod vere dico, illorum obscœnitate sic offendebar ut oculos etiam ipsos a quibusdam inter legendum averterem, tamen, ut illa ætate non satis cautus, ita illius quidem melle, istius vero salibus capiebar, ut in scribendo quam similimus eorum (de ipso caractere loquor) evadere studerem.*"

<sup>4</sup> Life of Calvin, by Thos. H. Dyer, London (Murray), 1850, p. 244.

<sup>5</sup> Not having the full Latin original we give this passage as translated by the friendly hand of a Calvinist: "*Iene Edlen aber schâmen sich nicht Alles, was ich in dictierischem Spiel (denn ein solches trieb mich ganz gewiss bei den meisten dieser Poesien,*

If this story were true, the innocence of the young student might be edifying, though in a well-taught Christian lad of sixteen or eighteen summers it could scarce be counted a prodigy. But it was not true either in fact or argument. And we can only pity the straits to which the theologian and "Evangelist" (as they called him) of riper years was reduced when called on to account for the wild sallies of his youth. He would have the world believe that the poems in question were written before his twentieth year. He had said, this once,<sup>1</sup> in his preface to the second edition of his poems, not only to remove the charge of immorality, but also, perhaps, with an author's vanity, and to forestall mere literary criticism, as the book was now obtaining a wider circle of readers. And consistency as well as shame made him stick to the statement. He repeated it again in his sixtieth year (1578). But the repetition of the assertion did not make it any the more credible. It met always the same smile of incredulous derision from his Lutheran and Catholic opponents. Nor has it found favor with his adherents and coreligionists of our day. Even Baum, his panegyrist rather than biographer, is forced to admit that Beza from interested motives has assigned a false date to these licentious effusions of his youth. With the modesty of a devotee, yet with the frankness of an impartial historian, he "ventures" to deny the truth of Beza's assertion.<sup>2</sup>

---

welche ich, die Alten nachahmend, verfertigt, ehe ich selber Altershalben verstand was das bedeute) von den Liebeleien jener poetischen Candida geschrieben, auf die keusche, auserwählte Gattin zu beziehen." Theodor Beza nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt von Johan Wilh. Baum, Leipzig, 1843, p. 78. In addition to the silly excuse, he here adroitly manages to misstate the true issue between himself and his adversaries, Catholic and Lutheran.

<sup>1</sup> In his letter dedicating the *Juvenilia* (2d edition) to Wolmar: "Hic (at Orleans) a me intra annum ætatis vicesimum *perscripta fere sunt omnia* poemata quæ aliquot post annos edidi." (Baum's *Beza*, p. 29.) Melchior (or as Beza affectedly calls him, Melior) Wolmar was the teacher by whom Beza had been seduced into Lutheranism, as the new religion was then called in France.

<sup>2</sup> "Fast alle Gedichte dieser Art (the poems addressed to Candida) tragen einen Charakter von Intimität, welcher viel besser auf seine spätern pariser Verhältnisse passt als auf die in Orleans. Ich wage dies zu behaupten gegen die ausdrücklichen Worte Beza's," l. c. p. 29. He goes on to explain how Beza's position later in life, and the attacks of his enemies MAY (how kind this little word, but how untrue!) have moved him to antedate the poems as far back as possible. "Die spätere Stellung des Mannes, die Jesuitische Anklagsucht und Anderes, MAG ihn bewogen haben diese Arbeiten so früh als möglich zu setzen." When your anti-Catholic combatant is sore beset, he never fails to fall back on the Jesuits for assistance. Surely, no Jesuit ever distinguished himself by assaulting Beza. The Launays, Bolsecs, Castalios, and Remonds were not members of the Order. And it would be hard to find any one, Jesuit or not, who has said more to the injury of Beza's character than the Lutheran theologians, from the fiery Schlusseberg (in his *Theologia Calviniana*) to the impartial biographer Schlosser, in our own day. That ugly compound of prevarication, fraud, evasion, mental reservation, etc., to which calumny has affixed the name of



Had Beza in his younger days been taken to task for his verses, he would in all probability have imitated his lewd Pagan masters, put on a bold face, and defiantly maintained that moral soundness was the duty of the poet himself, but not of his strains, which might be good or wicked as he chose to make them, and that their so-called wickedness only gave them an additional charm of elegance :

Nam castum esse decet pium poetam  
Ipsum : Versiculos nihil necesse est,  
Qui tum denique habent salem ac leporem,  
Si sint molliculi ac parum pudici.

Or he might have argued that his verse could not be fairly taken as an index to his life, and that his poetic flights might follow a very different path from his daily walk and conversation. Or with still greater effrontery, like him of Sulmona, he might have rushed at once from theory to fact and boldly maintained that his muse was naughty but his life beyond reproach.

Crede mihi, mores distant a carmine nostro;  
Vita verecunda est, musa jocosa mihi.<sup>1</sup>

But what might have passed unheeded in the mouth of the young debauchee of Paris would have roused the indignation of all religious men through Europe, and have probably led to inquiries and fatal discoveries if uttered at Geneva by the elderly theologian and Pontiff<sup>2</sup> of the Reformed Church.

Unquestionably, Beza's life, as Dyer<sup>3</sup> says, was as free as his verses. And Schlosser<sup>4</sup> intimates plainly enough that the early career of this young gallant would have furnished an ample field for confession had he been disposed later in life, or had the circumstances in which he was placed allowed him, to imitate the candor of an Augustine. His plea of youthful ignorance during his student

---

*Jesuitism*, was never better exemplified than in the daily life and actions of the leading Reformers, both on the Continent of Europe and in Great Britain, as impartial history bears witness.

<sup>1</sup> Trist, II, 353.

<sup>2</sup> This was the name by which Beza was generally known in Germany. At the conference of Mompelgard with the Lutherans, when Beza was unwilling to come to definite action, saying that a few theologians might agree on articles of faith, but the two Churches (Lutheran and Calvinist) would not accept their decision, Andreae, the Tübingen Superintendent, answered him : " Fear not. They call me the German (Lutheran) Pope, and you are known as the Pope of the French. Let us put our heads together and agree, and all the Bishops under us will follow." This anecdote is told by Beza himself. Nor was it all a joke on the part of Andreae, for he seems to have entertained a high idea of his own power and infallibility.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> Apud Baum, p. 63.

life in Orleans (to which period he would restrict the composition of his *Juvenilia*) is worth nothing to any one who has read Beza's own accounts of the condition of things in the law-school of that city, or who is acquainted with the horrible immorality of nearly all the universities at that period, and those especially in which Lutheranism was established, or into which it was beginning to creep. No innocence, no tender age was likely to be a safeguard against the prevailing corruption. They were wholesale sinks of immorality, and were so denounced in private and public even by the ministers of the new religion. The year after Beza left Orleans, Rudolph Gualterius (Walther), writing to Bullinger,<sup>1</sup> gives a fearful picture of the students and professors of the University of Marburg. The same was no less true of Rostock, Jena, Frankfort, Tübingen (styled by its own superintendent a new Sodom and Gomorrah), Helmstadt, Königsberg, and others.<sup>2</sup> Wittemberg, where Luther lived, preached, and taught by word and example, enjoyed the bad pre-eminence that well became the birthplace and chief seat of the new religion, which taught, amongst other things, that good works were unnecessary, and perhaps a hindrance to salvation. Preachers, like Musæus, who had seen the results of Wittemberg education, denounced the place from their pulpits as the Devil's own foul cess-pool (eine stinkende Cloake des Teufels). They warned parents, as they valued their own and their children's salvation, not to send their sons to that den of iniquity. It were far better, said another from his pulpit, that a mother should plunge a dagger into her son's heart, or consign him at once to a house of public infamy, than send him to Wittemberg. Camerarius had already, in 1536, consulted Luther whether it would not be better to abolish all public schools in Lutheran Germany, since they had become so many hiding-places for vice and iniquity.<sup>3</sup> Melanchthon used to say with

---

<sup>1</sup> This letter was first published by Fuesslin in the middle of the last century, in his *Beyträge zur Erläuterung der Kirchen-Reformations-Geschichten des Schweitzerlandes*, Zurich, 1742-1758. His words are: "Disciplina morum hic talis est, qualem Bacchadibus suis Lyæus et Cupidinibus Venus præscripsit . . . Sed cur non his uterentur moribus discipuli, cum maxima professorum pars hæc soleat?" "The law of morals here is such as the God of wine would lay down for his Bacchantes, and Venus for her Cupids . . . But why should the students act otherwise when such are the morals of most of the professors?" Not long after William, Landgrave of Hesse, in whose territory lay Marburg University, wrote a letter to the Duke of Holstein, begging him to forego his purpose of sending his son there, because (as he mildly stated the case) its morals were not the best (weil daselbst die Sitten nicht zum Besten wären).

\* See the authorities given in full by Döllinger: *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwicklung und ihre Wirkungen*, Regensburg, 1848, vol. i. pp. 230, 506-21.

<sup>3</sup> Ego quidem sæpe cogito, an non satius sit nullas esse publicas scholas, quam hoc otium quasi asylum improbitati et vitiis constitutum. Ep. ad Luth. apud Döllinger l. c. p. 525.

tears, that in the horrible corruption of the Wittemberg scholastic youth he recognized a sign of the coming end of the world. Melanchthon, at least, was not personally responsible for what he thus deplored; but it would have been a more profitable inquiry on his part to search out, or rather open his eyes to the manifest sources of such universal corruption, than to keep on tearfully prognosticating its results.

Whatever may have been Beza's student life in Orleans, his subsequent residence in Paris, from the twenty-first to the twenty-ninth year of his age, was one continued course of frivolous dissipation and dissoluteness. His own reticence generally, and (when compelled to speak) his evasions and almost uniform substitution of side issues to elude the main point in question, the fierce and perhaps exaggerated assaults of his enemies, the adroit excuses and apologies of his friends—all have combined to darken rather than illustrate this chapter of his life. It is, at all events, an ugly chapter, and contains no single line to please or edify the impartial Christian reader. By an abuse then only too prevalent, his fond uncle made over to him the possession of some rich ecclesiastical benefices; and these enabled the gay youth to lead a merry life, and gratify every lawless caprice. When only sixteen he had learned the new Gospel from Wolmar, who had taught him that the Catholic Church was the synagogue of Satan, and he saw no impropriety in spending her revenues in the service of sin and riotousness. In his own carefully worded reference to his Paris life, he admits<sup>1</sup> that the devil held him bound by three strong chains: the allurements of sensual pleasure, which are abundant and overpowering in that city, the hope of poetical fame, and the prospects of preferment at court. We could not expect him to say more, but his Protestant biographers add some details that partially fill up the picture. "The lady whom he celebrates in his poems under the name of *Candida* seems to have been the wife of a tailor living in the Rue de Calandre at Paris, with whom he had formed a criminal connection. A dangerous illness in 1548, said to have been the result of his profligacy, awakened more serious thoughts and occasioned his journey to Geneva, where he married the woman with whom he had cohabited in France."<sup>2</sup> Beza's own avowal that the woman he took with him to Geneva was of an inferior position in life, lends some color of truth to this statement. Schlosser, how-

<sup>1</sup> Ausser jenen oben erwähnten Hindernissen hatte mich Satan damals mit dreien gewaltigen Banden umgeben: den Lockungen der Wollust, die in jener Stadt zahllos und am mächtigsten sind, den süßen Schmeichelhoffnungen des Ruhms u. s. w. Apud Baum, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 245.

ever, represents him as secretly marrying a young woman, whom he had failed to lead astray. This partially tallies with Baum's version and Beza's own, who represent her as a virtuous woman. Baum gives her name as Claude Desnosz. It was the name she bore in Geneva; but that does not prove that it had been her name in France. Beza himself fled to Geneva under an assumed name (Thiebaud de May), and he might have given another to the companion of his flight. De Saintes and Launay may not be sufficient authority to prove that the woman in question was Candida; but their testimony is as credible as Beza's. And since he was not overscrupulous in his adherence to truth where his interests were at stake, as Baum himself admits, we see no reason why his exculpatory assertions should be received as true on the strength of his own unsupported word. He claims that there was a private marriage as far back as 1544. This may be true; but the man who antedates his poems to save his character might not stick at antedating his marriage for the same purpose, especially where no chance of detection was possible. The marriage, if there was one, was private indeed, without witnesses, and very much after what Indian poets would call the *Gandharva* fashion.<sup>1</sup> The reasons he assigns for keeping his engagement secret are, first, that he did not wish to give offence to any one; and next he could not (euphemism for *would not*) get rid of the devil's money which he was drawing from his church livings.<sup>2</sup> Whether from fear of the coming storm, or because he wished sincerely to profess and practice the new religion, or from other yet undiscovered motive, he abandoned France and made his way to Geneva. The last thing he did before quitting his native soil was characteristic of the man. "In order to provide the necessary funds he sold his benefices; for though he had renounced the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, he did not scruple to enrich himself with her spoils, which he considered lawful prize, according to the example of the Israelites when quitting the land of Egypt."<sup>3</sup> And thus with a clouded

---

<sup>1</sup> "Manu in his Book III. gives the form of eight different kinds of marriage. This (the *Gandharva*) is that without ceremonies and by mutual consent." Edwin Arnold, *The Book of Good Counsels* from the Sanscrit (London, 1861), p. 157 (note). But even the *Gandharva* rite does not exclude witnesses. That there were none in Beza's case, appears from his own words.

<sup>2</sup> "Theils damit ich den Anderen keinen Anstoss gäbe, theils weil ich mich von jenem Teufischen Gelde, das ich von den oben erwähnten geistlichen Pfründen zog, noch nicht losmachen konnte." Baum, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Dyer, l. c. Launay adds something still more flagrant. According to him, Beza not only robbed the Church by selling his own benefices, but fraudulently obtained an advance of money on some other benefice to which he had no title. It is not enough to reply that Launay afterwards returned to the Catholic Church. This, surely, does not make him a false witness; if it does, Beza's credibility must suffer on parallel grounds. Launay states as a public, notorious fact, that when Beza came into France

reputation, laden with the plunder of his Babylonian foe, he abandoned the scene of his former follies and vices, and departed to a strange land, where he could safely, without risk of confession or martyrdom, teach the world the pure, unalloyed meaning of the Scriptures, reform Catholic faith and morals, and do his best to destroy the Church he had robbed and betrayed!

Had Beza done nothing more than publish his *Juvenilia*, and lead a loose life in youth at Paris, history would have let his follies sleep forever in oblivion. The Catholic Church has had too many such among her children, whose muse was heathen and immoral, and whose lives in youth were a source of scandal. They generally ended, however, by bewailing their misspent days, atoning for the past, and turning their poetic powers to the praises of God and of His Saints. But when a man of this stamp, who has not washed out his sins by repentance, undertakes to raise his voice and hand against the Church of the Living God, boldly tells her that she has forfeited the promises of her Heavenly Founder, denounces her as buried for centuries in ignorance and error, and claims a mission to change and correct her doctrinal and moral teaching, we surely have the right to inquire into the antecedents and examine the character of the man who arrogates to himself such mission. The history of the Church for almost nineteen centuries has taught us that whenever God raises up a man to reform His Church by bringing back her children to the practice of the Gospel, He always invests him with a character that bears witness to itself. He will have all the virtues that he recommends. He will preach both by word and deed, or, as St. John says, not only *verbo atque lingua sed opere et veritate*. (1 John iv.) And we have learned also from the same history, as well as from the warnings of Holy Writ, what manner of men are they of whom God complains, that they presume to run without being sent, and to prophesy without being inspired;<sup>1</sup> who will not hear the Church, but attempt to teach her; who raise their puny arms in the mad attempt to pull down and overthrow the Pillar and Ground of Truth. On investigation it always comes to light that such men are not saints—not moved by the Spirit of God—but the slaves of sense or devoured by Satanic pride. And to come to our immediate point, when one of them gives himself

---

to attend the Conference of Poissy, at which there were present twelve Calvinist ministers, including Launay himself, the complaints of the defrauded creditor's family were so loud and pressing that to save themselves from further embarrassment and stave off the scandal to their Church, the ministers collected enough from their Church funds to repay his widow and son; and that he (Launay) was charged with the repayment. Unless there was some truth in the story, it would have been a bold risk to set it afloat, as long as any of those ministers were yet alive.

<sup>1</sup> I sent them not, yet they ran. I have not spoken to them, and yet they prophesied. Jer. xxiii. 21.

out as a discoverer of the hidden sense of God's Word, and presumes to expound it in opposition to the belief of all the Fathers of the Church, and of the whole Christian world, it surely is pertinent to inquire whether the new interpreter be self-commissioned or raised up by Providence to meet the necessities of the Church; whether his previous character for truth, honesty, and Christian life be such as to recommend his good purpose, or, on the other hand, such as to excite distrust of his pretensions. Hence we do not consider out of place what has been thus far said of Beza's life and character, up to the very day when he turned reformer and interpreter of the Word of God.<sup>1</sup>

The sense of the Bible may be explained or distorted in two ways: by translation or by commentary. Beza tried his hand at both; but it is of the former only that we intend to speak. In the wicked art of insinuating dogmatical error by mistranslation he stands almost without a rival. In the abundance and recklessness of those perversions none have equalled him; in the effrontery which avowed and sought to justify them he is surpassed by none but Luther. Others, indeed, have sought to intrude their opinions into the Sacred Text by adroit omissions, additions, and false renderings; but they did it stealthily, for they were conscious of wrong and feared detection. Not so Luther and Beza, whose Bibles are the doctrinal foundations of the Lutheran and Anglican churches. They make no secret of their shame, but publish it, defend it, and glory in it. The others were tempted by the opportunity of drawing Scripture to their side, and yielded to the temptation. Luther and Beza mistranslate and pervert Scripture on theory and principle. Yet there is some difference between them. Luther quailed before the indignant outcry of the Catholic world, and in subsequent editions, from shame or policy, suppressed some of his worst perversions. We are not sure that the translator of Geneva ever retracted or corrected more than one passage.

Passing over the many errors of Beza, arising either from negligence or human frailty or from his ignorance of the Oriental languages and of all Greek outside of its classic region, we shall give some specimens of those only which were deliberately undertaken from a sectarian spirit. With that fine poetical genius of his, it would be almost a cruel injustice to suppose him really at heart a sincere believer in the crudities, as impious as absurd, of Calvinism. We should rather think he was skeptically inclined. It was as easy for him to

---

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it must not be forgotten that his loose life and writings belong to a time when, though outwardly a Catholic, he was *intus et in cute a thorough Lutheran*. He tells us himself that God had mercifully brought him to the knowledge of "the Gospel" (such was their pet name for the new religion) in his sixteenth year.

exchange Lutheran opinions for Calvinistic as it had been to discard the religion of his fathers for Lutheranism. Gratitude and his position, therefore, rather than innate zeal for the new doctrines, urged him to do what he could with the pen for the propagation of the views of his teacher and benefactor, Calvin, and for the advancement of the sect that had bestowed upon him honors and emoluments. And the work that he did on their behalf, disgraceful and wicked as it was, endures in its evil consequences even to this day.

Wherever there was a chance of recommending as Scriptural the newfangled theories of Calvinism, or marking as unscriptural the Catholic doctrines touching free-will, good works, merit, justification, predestination, etc., Beza has seldom failed to make use of it. For example, thanks to the "horrible decrees," God is the author of all moral good and all moral evil. If a Catholic presumed to answer that sin can only be said to come from God *permissive*, Calvin and his school would raise the cry of "sophistry," and exhort their hearers to shun this papistical delusion, which excludes God from active concurrence. God is as much the author (the Christian may shudder, but it was their favorite illustration) of David's adultery and the treachery of Judas, as of Paul's calling and apostolate. And Beza easily finds for all this a warrant in Scripture. St. Peter (1 Epistle ii. 8) terms Christ a rock of scandal to the stiff-necked Jews, "who stumble at the Word and do not believe whereunto they are also set." So reads at present our Rhemish New Testament, and this is strictly conformable to the Greek (εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐπεθῆσαν). But the Latin had "in quo et positi sunt." And in this sense it was rendered in some of the early Anglican Bibles, "they believe not that whereon they were set;" and this meaning was indorsed by some of the moderate Lutherans, agreeably enough to their master's version, "und glauben nicht daran darauf sic gesetzt sind." So, too, Erasmus, and even Calvin. But Beza, by changing the word and substituting "created," brings out the "horrible decree" in its full force. "Disobedient, unto which they were created." The end, therefore, for which they were made by God is that they may disobey Him and perish eternally. Beza did not escape the censure of the Lutheran Flacius Illyricus for this, even in his own day. The text does not necessarily imply any connection between God's action and their guilt. And even if it did, it might simply indicate (by an ordinary Hebraism end or purpose being put for mere effect or consequence) the appointed order of Providence, in which reprobation follows upon a certain measure of guilt. But Beza, with his word "created," acts the interpreter, instead of the translator, and determines the meaning in the text. Again (Acts ii. 23) he mistranslates *πρόγνωσις* (prescience or foreknowledge) by "*providence*," to make out God's actual concurrence in the betrayal

and death of our Saviour. Even with the word "providence" the text would readily admit a Catholic interpretation, viz., that God willed positively the work of Redemption, and only permissively the sin of Judas and the Jews. But the translator's wanton change of words discloses his wicked intention of persuading the reader that the death of Christ for our sake upon the Cross, and the treachery of Judas, and the horrible crime of deicide, by which it was brought about, were all alike God's work. It is true that Beza afterwards, in his second edition (1584),<sup>1</sup> became ashamed of this change, and altered the word so as to give its true meaning (*præcognitio*); but the mischief he had intended had been sufficiently wrought. It had already penetrated into the French, Italian, and Spanish Versions, made by apostates at Bale and Geneva.<sup>2</sup> And, besides, on such poor authority, it has found a permanent place in our Greek dictionaries, where we are told that besides its proper meaning of prescience, foreknowledge, etc., it has also "sometimes in the New Testament the sense of *decree, counsel, will*."<sup>3</sup> Thus is unsuspecting youth made to drink sectarian poison from sources in which no one could suspect its existence!

If there was anything that grated on the ears of the Reformers, it was the ascribing of merit to the just or their good works. Yet nothing is more clearly laid down as Christ's doctrine in the New Testament. See Apoc. xxii. 11; Math. v. 10-12; xxv. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 17. These texts (especially where eternal life is called *μισθός* or *merces*) are too clear and could not well be meddled with. But there are others less direct, and here Beza exercised his ingenious pen. Wherever demerit or unworthiness is mentioned, the text is properly translated; where worth or merit occurs, it is skilfully thrust out of sight. Though *αξιός*, *ικανός*, *αξιώω*, and *ικανώω* all imply *worth*, merit, deserving, etc., he has two weights and measures, one of which is uniformly used when occasion offers to turn the word against the Catholic doctrine. If the Baptist declares himself not worthy (*ικανός*) to carry or loosen the sandals of our Lord, or if the Centurion is, by his own testimony, not worthy

<sup>1</sup> See this amended version reproduced (by the side of the Vulgate) in the "Libri Omnes Historici N. T." (of Balduin Walæus), Amstelodami, 1662. The notes in this collection are principally taken from Beza's Commentary.

<sup>2</sup> See the Polyglot New Testament of Elias Hutter (Norimbergæ, 1599), tom. i. (Acts, p. 16.) The Spanish version is of Cassiodoro la Reyna, the Italian anonymous. The English version has correctly *foreknowledge*, because it follows the English Bible, published at Geneva in 1562, two years before Beza published his first edition. Otherwise, they would have been only too ready to follow their master in this as their successors did in his other perversions.

<sup>3</sup> See the lexicon of Benjamin Hedericus, at the word *πρόγνωσις*: "(1) *præsensio prænotio, præscientia*, (2) *rerum præsentium scientia*, etc., (3) in N. T. *interdum, decretum, consilium, voluntas*."



(*ἰκανός*) to have Him for a guest, then Beza translates as we do "non sum *dignus*" (I am not worthy).<sup>1</sup> But if there be any question of title to heavenly reward, then *ἰκανός*, *ἀξίος*, and the portion of them contained in *ἰκανῶς* and *ἀξιώ* „ are expressed by *idoneus*, *par*, etc. So in Colossians i. 12, where the apostle, speaking in his own name and that of those called to the light of God's kingdom, gives thanks to the Father above, "who has made us worthy" to be partakers with His Saints, Beza renders it "who hath made us fit (*idoneos*)."<sup>2</sup> In St. Matthew (iii. 8) and St. Luke (iii. 16), where sinners are exhorted to produce "fruits worthy of penance," Beza retains the word *dignus*, but destroys the habitude or proportion of the works to the virtue, by turning the phrase thus "*dignum iis qui resipuerint*" (worthy of those who have repented). This might seem a small matter to Catholics, but with Calvinists it appears to be otherwise, seeing the pertinacity with which they make it a rule to vary their mode of translation. Dr. Murdoch is a Presbyterian in belief, and a thorough Bezaite in his system of interpretation. He handles the Peshito as capriciously as Beza does the Greek text. In his Syriac original he found but one word in all those places, *Showe* (*dignus*) and its verb *Ashwi* (*dignum fecit*). Yet while John and the Centurion are "unworthy," the Apostle and his fellow-believers (Col. i. 12) are only "fitted" for the inheritance of the Saints, and the works "worthy of repentance" are somewhat pedantically metamorphosed into works "that are in accord with repentance" (Matth. iii. 11), or works "comporting with repentance" (Luc. iii. 8).<sup>3</sup>

The horror that Calvin and his sect have of merit leads them from error to downright blasphemy, and they ridicule as Catholic sophistry<sup>4</sup> the notion that Christ our Lord by His passion and death deserved to be glorified and exalted. St. Paul is too clear on this point to be gainsayed (Philip. ii. 9). Therefore Beza did

<sup>1</sup> Matth. iii. 11; Mark i. 7; Luc. iii. 16; Matth. viii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> So, too, his disciples blindly following their master's lead: the English *meet*, the Italian *abili*, the French *capables*, etc. We can scarcely imagine by what chance *dignos* (worthy) fell from the pen of the Spanish interpreter. See Hutter's Polyglot, vol. ii. p. 498.

<sup>3</sup> But the most cunning and watchful men have their careless moments. And it so happened to Beza in Luke xx. 35, and xxi. 36, where he translates *digni*, though it is a question of eternal life. Hence all of them forgot their *abili*, *capables*, *meet*, etc. The French Geneva has even *faits dignes*, and the Italian *fatti degni*, like the Vulgate. But the English Calvinist, with his habitual caution, has the ambiguous phrase "counted worthy." Even Dr. Murdoch, having no longer the fear of Beza before his eyes, forgets his "fitted," "in accord," and "comporting with," etc., and gives us the true meaning of his original "worthy."

<sup>4</sup> So Calvin repeatedly. See his Commentaries on the New Testament, edited by Tholuck, at Berlin, 1834, vol. vii. p. 15, and vol. vi., ad Philip. ii. 9.

not meddle with this passage. But he took in hand another (Hebr. ii. 9),<sup>1</sup> and by artful transposition of its clauses expunged from it or at least obscured the Catholic sense. His servile imitators, English, French, and others, in like manner darken the sense; and the apostate Spaniard has excelled them by striking out effectually St. Paul's Catholic meaning.<sup>2</sup>

Calvin teaches that human actions, whether good or bad, are not in man's power, but that they are, each and every one of them, wrought in virtue of God's eternal decree and predestination. There is therefore no free-will, man has no power of his own; God's power works in him the good and the evil. What Calvin taught from the pulpit and by treatise and commentary, Beza was determined to find in the text of Scripture, to put it there if wanting, and, if he found the contrary, to eliminate it from the sacred page. Thus, for example, St. Paul<sup>3</sup> speaks of human nature as being weak, in order to commend the goodness of God who came down from Heaven to give it strength. The phrase he uses is "we being weak" (ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν). The metaphor is taken from a sick man, as Macknight<sup>4</sup> well observes, who is unable to help himself, who has lost his strength, or almost all. But enough of it, scanty as it is, remains to derive help and increase from the remedies given. So, too, weak and helpless as the sinner may be, enough of strength, that is of free-will, remains to him to be moved, acted upon, and strengthened by grace, and made to co-operate with the Divine Worker in seeking and obtaining healing and salvation. But this metaphor would not suit Beza, who held that man had no strength at all and was a mere automaton in the hands of God. He therefore corrected the Apostle by substituting for *weakness* in the text the absolute negation of all strength. He renders it "quum nullis viribus essemus," or as the Geneva French more emphatically puts it "du temps que nous estions encore desnués de toute force."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The proper and literal meaning of the verse in Greek is: "We behold the same Jesus, who was made somewhat less than the Angels, (now) crowned with honor and glory because of his suffering death." In order to pervert the Catholic idea of the Apostle, his words were thus transposed by Beza: "We behold Jesus crowned with honor and glory, who was somewhat inferior to the Angels, because of his suffering death," to lead the reader into the notion that Christ's passion and death explain why he was somewhat inferior to the Angels. The Anglican Bible of to-day, being a shift and compromise between Geneva and Rome, is characteristically ambiguous.

<sup>2</sup> Empero vemos a aquel Jesus coronado de gloria y de honrra, que es hecho un poco menor que los Angeles por passion de muerte, etc., apud Hutter. <sup>3</sup> Rom. v. 6.

<sup>4</sup> "The original word ἀσθενῶν signifies *weak* through sickness, and is used here to show the pernicious influence of sin in weakening all the faculties of the soul." Macknight, *New Literal Translation of the Epistles*, Philadelphia, 1841, p. 81.

<sup>5</sup> Apud Hutter, tom. ii. p. 38. Luther, though holding the same opinions, is more honest ("da wir noch schwach waren").

The Catholic Church teaches that Christ, by His incarnation, wrought this change, that men should be no longer of necessity "children of wrath," but should be entitled, if they would, to become children of God. The benefit of redemption is offered him for his willing acceptance, not forced upon him as if he were merely passive. His free-will enables him to lend his ear to God who invites, and the grace which moved him to listen, grows with his good dispositions, and at last secures his obedience. From a sinner he becomes a servant and child of God. As long as he perseveres in this state, as long as he has good will, moved, guided, and strengthened by grace, he has in his hands the power to become a child of God in the highest sense of the word, and to claim eternal fellowship with God's children in heaven. But he must not glory in this power, for it is God's gift. And all this passes more or less distinctly through the mind of the Catholic who reads or hears, as he does every day at Mass, those words of St. John, "To as many as have received Him, He hath given POWER to become the children of God." But Beza saw free-will in the word "power," and though he elsewhere renders ἐξουσία by *potestas* (power), here he refuses to do so, lest, as he impudently says in his notes, it should give countenance to the Catholic sophists (this is the pet name for our theologians with Calvin and himself) in upholding their hateful doctrine of free-will. He, therefore, rendered it, "Dedit eis hanc dignitatem ut fierent," "He gave them this dignity that they should become," etc. In a subsequent edition, he altered this to "Dedit eis hoc jus ut facti fuerint," "He gave them this right (or privilege) that they have become," etc. According to Beza, a Christian and child of God, being little better than a stock or a stone, may be gifted indeed with dignities and rights at the hands of his heavenly Father, but not with power, lest it should interfere with God's exclusive right of omnipotence to drive man to sin or good works, to salvation or reprobation, as it should best please Him.

St. James teaches that faith without good works is dead, but through good works is made perfect. Hence he calls them co-workers with faith (James ii. 22). But this is intolerable to Calvinist ears. Hence Beza, not daring to say with Luther that one Apostle contradicts another, tries to disfigure and darken what he has not the boldness to deny. St. James says, "Faith worked together (*co-operated* in the Greek and Vulgate) with the works" of Abraham. Beza weakens this as far as he can venture in his

---

<sup>1</sup> Walæus, op. cit. p. 801. Beza's note is not given, but in its stead one from Daniel Heinsius, not unlike it in spirit, in which he professes his dislike for either *potestas*, *jus*, or *dignitas*, as the proper equivalent here for ἐξουσία, and suggests "prærogativa." In fact, this was the very word that had been used by the English Calvinistic Bibles of 1562, 1577, and 1579. The Genevan French has, like Beza, "ce droit."

translation, "Faith was a helper (administra) of his works." And in this he was followed by some, not all, of the English Calvinist versions. There is another text (Luke vii. 47) where Beza's craft shows itself, and has furnished a model for all English heterodox Bibles. The Reformers introduced a doctrine, which had been unknown to all Christendom since the days of the Apostles, viz., that faith alone justifies the sinner. The Catholic Church has always taught that, though faith is the primary cause of justification, yet there are other dispositions which must concur in the work, such as the fear of God, hope, love, sorrow for sin, etc. And so vital and important is their concurrence, that Scripture often attributes to one of them the work of justification, without any mention of faith or the other dispositions. The passage quoted from St. Luke is a case in point. Here the sinful woman, by testimony of Our Lord himself, is forgiven her many offences because of her great love. "I say to thee that many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much."

It was no easy matter to elude the plain meaning of this text. Beza began by selecting a word, *nam* (for), less pointed and of less connective force than *ὅτι* (because). But how slight after all the difference between "many sins are forgiven, *because* she loved," and "are forgiven, for she loved?" Beza saw it and called punctuation to his aid. He improved his work by changing the Greek comma after "forgiven" first into a colon, and finally into a full stop.<sup>1</sup> It then read thus "Many sins are forgiven her. For she loved much." Then, by means of a note, he justifies himself for having translated it (as he confesses) against Catholics, an "impudent, silly" set (as he styles them) of interpreters, who abuse this passage of St. Luke in order to overthrow the Solifidian doctrines brought in by the Reformers. He so translated it purposely, he adds, in order that his readers may understand that the clause ("for she loved much") is not an antecedent but a consequent. After this lucid explanation, what devout Calvinistic reader can fail to be convinced that Beza is right, and that Our Lord actually meant "she hath loved much," *because* much has been forgiven her. Why not say at once, as some do, that "because" is a Hebraism for "therefore," and give up tampering with the text? Why not plead the drift of the parable, which (as even some Catholic divines argue) seems to call for "therefore?" But Beza knew no Hebrew, and cared little for exegetical reasons. His only object, as he avows, was to wrest this text from its Catholic meaning; and to accomplish this, he would not shrink from mistranslation. The same recklessness is visible in some commentators of the English Protestant Church,

<sup>1</sup> Of this he became ashamed, and in subsequent editions it was changed to a colon.

heirs of his bad spirit no less than of his false doctrine. One of them<sup>1</sup> thinks that Our Lord's words ("thy faith hath saved thee," v. 50) are decisive against *because*. Then they are equally so against *for*, unless the punctuation be changed. Do they not, on the contrary, clearly prove what Catholics say, that neither love nor faith exclusively works justification, but that both concur, and hence by Scripture usage it is ascribed to either of them indifferently? It would seem a matter of great importance to our enemies to rid themselves, by fair means or foul, of this little word "*because*." The Catholic Church loses nothing, in whatever way it be translated.

But this is not the only place where Beza has changed the punctuation to suit his sectarian purpose. In translating 1 Timothy i. 13 he was confronted by the Catholic doctrine contained in the text, that a sinner receives grace not, indeed, in proportion to his merits, which are none, but inasmuch as he is found less undeserving, that is, in proportion to the fewer obstacles he puts in the way of its reception. This was gall and wormwood to the Calvinist interpreter, who had been taught that to bestow grace, to justify, to save, or to damn His creatures are so many absolute acts of God's conquering omnipotence, utterly irrespective of any dispositions, merits, or demerits, on the part of man. Yet the Apostle plainly teaches him from his own example, that to him who sins from ignorance rather than malice God will show that mercy which He will not extend to the stubborn sinner. Here are his words: "Who before was a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and contumelious; but I obtained mercy, *because* I did it ignorantly in unbelief." How was Calvinism to be got into such a text, or its anti-Calvinistic teaching to be gotten out of it? Beza arbitrarily changed the punctuation; and besides this the substitution of *for* (nam) for *because* (*ὅτι*), again stood him in good stead. Here is the way in which he translates it:

"Who before was a blasphemer, and persecutor, and doer of wrong to others: but I received mercy. For I did it being ignorant: that is lacking faith."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Either the Bishop of St. David's or Canon Cook, of Exeter, in the work placed at the head of this article.

<sup>2</sup> "Qui prius eram blasphemus et persecutor et injuriis alios afficiens: sed misericordia sum donatus. Nam ignorans id faciebam: nempe fidei expers." Thus it read in the first edition. But some feeling of shame got the better of him, and he restored the original punctuation. At least, in the edition of Zurich, 1671, which heads this article, the verse is as follows: "Qui prius eram blasphemus et persecutor et injuriosus: sed mei misertus est, nam ignorans id faciebam fidei expers." Here all is connected, and the interpolation *nempe* banished. The other changes (*mei misertus est* and *injuriosus*) are merely verbal. From the latter came the "injurious" of the English Bible; the old Geneva version had "oppressor." Dr. Campbell, who soundly rates Beza for this perversion, does not seem to have been aware of this

How cunningly the Apostle's obtaining mercy is here severed as far as possible from the negative disposition to which he ascribes it! And what a mine of Calvinistic theology may lie hidden under that little word *nempe*, which is falsely put into the mouth of St. Paul! Is, then, want of faith the same as ignorance on the part of the sinner, and is it the cause that of itself produces sin? Or is it meant to be insinuated that on the other hand he who has faith is in no danger of sinning? We know that Beza held from his master the inamissibility of justice and all the other abominable doctrines on this head invented by the founders of the new religion, and thus pithily formulated by Luther: "Every work done by an unbeliever is sin. In the believer there is no sin that can separate him from God. The only sin that can damn a man is unbelief. Even if a just man try to lose his soul by committing the most enormous sins, he cannot do it unless he refuse to believe."<sup>1</sup> It is astonishing how few readers know of these outrageous impious paradoxes spread out on the pages of the founder of modern heresy, though reprinted a hundred times in the last three centuries, and again more than once in our own day by his own children. What wonder is it that with such comfortable doctrines, Lutheran Germany soon became so corrupt in morals that many found their only relief in the thought that the end of the world was fast approaching. Calvin's doctrine of election is said to have been a great comfort during life and a solace in his dying hour to that monster of cruelty and hypocrisy, Oliver Cromwell.

Speaking of "inamissible justice," we must give another text, in which St. Paul *volens nolens* has been dragged down to the exact standard of Calvinist orthodoxy by this unscrupulous interpreter. In Hebrews x. 38, the Apostle, applying and explaining a prophecy of Habacuc, says, "The just man shall live by faith; but if *HE*

---

change. See his four Gospels, translated, with dissertations and notes, Andover, 1837, vol. i. p. 384. Or perhaps the change was not made by Beza, but by editors after his death.

<sup>1</sup> See Luther's Epistle to Melancthon from the Wartburg, his treatise de Captivitate Babylonica, and his Works *passim*, for if he has said these things once, he has said them a hundred times. We have given before an extract from his letter to Melancthon; we now give a passage (Englished in the text) from his Book on the Babylonian Bondage. "Ita vides quam dives sit homo Christianus: etiam volens non potest perdere salutem quantiscumque peccatis nisi nolit credere. Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas." Luth. Opp. (Erlangen), vol. v. p. 59.

The horrid doctrine that everything, good or bad, done by an unbeliever is a sin, so repugnant to Scripture and common sense, was held not only by Luther and Calvin, with their disciples, but also by some bad men inside of the Church, Jansenius, the Port-Royalists, Quesnel, etc., who pretended to be Catholics in spite of Rome's anathemas. They have received their reward *before men*. For the non-Catholic world with one accord glorifies their memory, and has canonized them in its calendar as saints, martyrs, heroic confessors, etc.

draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in HIM." Here we have evidently a supposition that one justified and made a friend of God may fall away from grace by his own act and become displeasing to God. But this is inconsistent with Calvin's doctrine, with which Beza will allow neither Paul nor any other inspired writer to interfere. "NON PATIAR," he says, in the spirit, if not in the words, of Luther,<sup>1</sup> "I WILL NOT ALLOW this passage of Paul to stand in the way of my master's theory." And he accomplishes his purpose by mistranslation. Here is his version :

"Justus autem ex fide vivet; at si quis se subduxerit, non EST GRATUM animo meo."<sup>2</sup>

Thus we have substituted for the just man, of whom St. Paul speaks, a vague personage (QUIS) of whom the Saint never dreamed, and in the second clause a neuter or impersonal action (non est gratum), which says, in general terms, that "God is not pleased," instead of what St. Paul clearly intends, His positive displeasure with the just man (ἐν αὐτῷ) who becomes a prevaricator. The Anglican Bishop, Pearson, qualifies this wicked perversion but too mildly when he says, "Illa verba a Theodoro Beza haud bona fide sunt translata." (Theodore Beza has not translated these words in good faith.) Dr. Campbell's comment is more just and more to the purpose. "This is one of the many passages in which this interpreter (Beza) has judged that the sacred penmen having expressed themselves incautiously and given a handle to the patrons of erroneous tenets, stood in need of him more as a corrector than a translator." But neither Bishop Pearson nor Dr. Campbell have any word of complaint (nor even of information to their readers) that this gross error yet disfigures the authorized Bible of King James. Will the Anglo-American Committee of Revision erase this blasphemous perversion of the true words, inspired by the Holy Ghost and written by St. Paul, but altered and defaced by the Anglican translators out of blind devotion to their Genevese master? We hope so; for we are told they mean well and honestly. But, as far as we can judge from what we have heard and seen, their labors are intended to remove rather philological errors than

<sup>1</sup> "Superest locus ille Pauli quem NON PATIAR adversari huic sententiae." Luther's letter to Melancthon, 9th of September, 1521, in *De Wette Luther's Briefe*, Berlin, 1826, tom. ii. p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> "The just man shall live by faith; but if ANY ONE withdraw himself, IT shall not please my soul." This was in the first edition; but afterwards (as in the edition of Zurich, 1671) the latter clause has been amended thus: "at si quis se subduxerit, non probet eum animus meus." Campbell says that in the old English Bibles it reads: "If HE withdraw himself," etc. He cannot mean *all*, for the Genevese version (1562), reprinted in Hutter's Polyglot, has "if ANY withdraw, my soul," etc. The same foul corruption is found in the French, Spanish, and Italian Bibles manufactured in the workshop of Geneva.

theological mistranslations. From the character of some of the revisors (Unitarians, Broad-churchmen, and infidels) we should naturally expect some impartiality. But these men are in the minority, and as likely as not to be overpowered by the great "Protestant tradition" which holds that Rome, like Cato's Carthage, must be destroyed, and that for such an end all means, good and bad, are lawful and becoming. Yet we will not despair. A few months hence we shall know our fate. The revisors will have issued their final decision, and then perhaps

Sarem fuor di speranza e fuor d'errore.

In the eyes of Calvin and Beza it is only "a popish figment" to maintain that Christ died for all men, or that He wills the salvation of all. This is a favor reserved to the orthodox few, whom the eternal decrees will save in spite of their sins. But the Catholic Church did not invent this doctrine. It was revealed to her from the beginning and recorded in her Sacred Books (Rom. xiv. 15; Cor. viii. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6; iv. 10; Jo. xvii. 19; 1 Jo. ii. 2). Beza did not find it convenient to meddle with all these texts. He only selected a few which he so contrived to amend as to prevent his readers from being misled by what he considered the excessive indulgence of the sacred penmen. In 1 Tim. ii. 9, the Apostle says that God "will have ALL men to be saved," and again v. 6, He gave Himself a ransom for ALL. There can be no mistake as to the true meaning of the terms used by the writer, πάντας ἀνθρώπους and ὑπὲρ πάντων. The proper Latin word, to convey the Apostle's idea, would have been *omnes* (used by our Vulgate) or *cuncti* or *singuli*. But to Beza any of these terms seemed to express too clearly St. Paul's meaning and to overthrow Calvin's theory. Hence he determined to shun them one and all, as *cane pejus et angue*. He chose in their stead the word *quivis*, the universality of which points to class and character rather than simply number. His version is "*quosvis* homines vult servari" and (v. 6) "*qui sese ipse dedit redemptionis pretium pro quibusvis*." That is as much as to say Christ has purchased by His blood, and wills the salvation, not of all individual men, but of men of all sorts and kinds. His eternal decrees do not regard the rich or the poor, the mighty or the lowly, the learned or the unlettered, but pick out some from all these classes. This perversion is so barefaced that none of the other Genevese versions, whether French, Spanish, Italian, or English, has ventured to follow Beza. Yet his influence in thus translating has been felt in Protestant Great Britain, and his in-



genious substitute for "all men" is yet heard on the lips of her ministers, when they speak of the Saviour of mankind.<sup>1</sup>

In the same epistle (iv. 10) the Apostle rejects the Calvinistic theory so explicitly that it would seem almost impossible to elude the force of his language. But in the service of his sect Beza's zeal was daunted by no difficulty. St. Paul says that Christ is "the Saviour of all men (πάντων ἀνθρώπων), especially of the faithful." This latter limiting clause only brings into clearer light the universality spoken of in the former ("ALL men"). As this made it impossible to garble the sense by substituting *quorumvis* for *omnium*, Beza boldly lays hold of the appellation given our Lord by the Apostle, and weakens and obscures its meaning. He calls him the Preserver (instead of Saviour) of all men, "Qui est conservator omnium hominum, maxime vero fidelium." The word Σωτήρ (Saviour) occurs twenty-two times in the New Testament, and everywhere else<sup>2</sup> Beza translates it by *servator*.<sup>3</sup> His having chosen another and (as he considered it) a much weaker word, shows his bad purpose of saving Calvinism at the expense of St. Paul. None of the other Calvinist interpreters has had the courage to imitate him, except the French Genevese version, which translates "le conservateur de tous hommes."<sup>4</sup>

In spite of Beza's rigid moral theories and dreadful, eternal decrees, he is practically indulgent for the sake of the elect and the orthodox, which are with him almost synonymous. When it is a question of sinners who are to be punished with damnation, he

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Campbell observes that "there are amongst ourselves (in Great Britain) certain divines, who in quoting these passages of scripture never say, would have *all men to be saved*, and *the Saviour of all men*, but invariably *all sorts of men*; charitably intending by this prudent correction to secure the unwary from being seduced by the latitudinarian expressions of the Apostle" (Four Gospels, vol. i. p. 382).

<sup>2</sup> Except in Eph. v. 23, where it is slightly paraphrased: Qui dat salutem corpori.

<sup>3</sup> Out of affectation of a purer Latinity, he (like his enemy, Castalio) would not use the word *Salvator*, by which our Lord is called in the Vulgate, and by which he was known to all Christians from the beginning. The words *salvo* and *salvator* are not found in Cicero, hence they are discarded by writers of classical Latin, who use in their stead *servo* and *servator*. But it is very doubtful whether the latter word renders accurately the idea we attach to saviour. Cicero, who ought to know, says there is no one Latin word that can express the Greek *soter* in its fulness. "Hoc quantum est! Ita magnum, ut Latino uno verbo exprimi non possit." (Acts ii., in Ver., lib. iv., cap. 63.) Had our early Christian fathers deemed the word *servator* sufficient, they would not have sought another. St. Augustine, in one of his sermons, makes a very good remark on this subject. He says: "Nec quærant grammatici quam sit Latinum, sed Christiani quam verum. Salus enim Latinum nomen est. Salvare et Salvator, non fuerunt hæc Latina antequam veniret Salvator: quando ad Latinos venit, et hæc Latina fecit."

The first time the word "Salvator" occurs in pagan classical literature is on an inscription in the reign of Trajan.

<sup>4</sup> In Hutter's Polyglot, tom. ii. p. 596.

becomes quite lenient. In vain do St. Paul and St. John cry out<sup>1</sup> with warning voice that murder, hatred, envy, sorcery, adultery, uncleanness, drunkenness exclude from salvation; and that such as do these things (*qui talia agunt*, as his own version has it with the Vulgate) shall not be heirs to the kingdom of Heaven, but shall be left outside, while the just enter by the gates into the City. This, indeed, is taught throughout the whole New Testament. But Beza, for reasons of his own, undertakes to correct this teaching. He would have us believe that it is not the commission of these sins, but the *habit* of committing them that forfeits salvation. Christ at the last day will banish from His presence not occasional sinners, but only those who have made sin their profession and constant occupation. To inculcate this view, he translates improperly Matth. vii. 23; xiii. 41; Luke xiii. 27; 1. John iii. 9, and perhaps other places that we cannot now call to mind.<sup>2</sup> We give first the English (with St. Jerome's Latin) and then Beza's perversion. "Depart from me, ye who work iniquity," *qui operamini iniquitatem* (Matth. vii. 23). "The Son of man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all scandals and them that work iniquity (*eos qui faciunt iniquitatem*), and shall cast them into the furnace of fire" (Matt. xiii. 41). "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity," *omnes operarii iniquitatis* (Luke xiii. 27). "Every one that is born of God, committeth no sin," *omnis qui natus est ex Deo, peccatum non facit* (1. John iii. 9). Instead of the passages quoted above in St. Jerome's Latin, Beza's rendering is as follows: Matth. vii. 23, "Qui operam datis transgressioni legis."<sup>3</sup> The next (Matth. xiii. 41), "Eos qui dant operam transgressioni legis."<sup>4</sup> The third (Luke xiii. 27), "Omnes qui datis operam iniquitati."<sup>5</sup> And finally in St. John's Epistle, "Quisquis natus est ex Deo, peccato non dat operam."<sup>6</sup>

The purpose of Beza in replacing "*facere*" (to do) by the phrase "*dare operam*," betrays itself only too clearly. *Dare operam* is not simply "to do," but to apply oneself strenuously and earnestly, to devote oneself to any pursuit. None, therefore, will be lost to the company of saints and angels, none deprived of the beatific vision, but those who are so depraved that they make of iniquity the business of their life. In the just man two or three sins amount to

<sup>1</sup> Gal. v. 21; Apoc. xxii. 14, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Campbell, in his review of Beza as a translator (Gospels, vol. i., pp. 372-90), notices the first and the last, but has overlooked the two others.

<sup>3</sup> So in Walæus's ed. of Beza's version; but in the edition used by Dr. Campbell "*iniquitati*" stands in place of "*transgressioni legis*" (*συνουσία*). In the Zurich ed. of 1671 it is "*qui facitis iniquitatem*."

<sup>4</sup> But in the Zurich of 1671, "*eos qui faciunt iniquitatem*."

<sup>5</sup> So in ed. of Walæus; but in ed. of Zurich, "*omnes qui facitis quod injustum est*."

<sup>6</sup> Changed likewise to "*peccatum non committit*" in the Zurich edition.

nothing ; to forfeit his chance of heaven he must become an habitual sinner. Nay, even habitual sinning is not sufficient to rob him of his prerogative. His sins must not only be habitual but enormous and breaches of every commandment. If any were to suspect that here we are going too far, exaggerating and almost slandering Beza, we should not wonder at the suspicion. But it is no slander, no exaggeration. We only repeat Beza's explanation of what he meant by *dare operam*. In his note on Matth. vii. 23, he thus explains the words "qui operam datis," etc. :

"Id est, OMNIBUS SCELERIBUS et FLAGITIIS ADDICTI homines, Hebraico idiotismo (*poale aven*) et qui velut artem peccandi exercent, sicut Latini medicinam, argentariam *facere* dicunt. Hi sunt qui in sacris libris passim ἀμαρτωλοί, id est, *peccatores* dicuntur."<sup>2</sup>

The last sentence, in which the meaning of "doers of iniquity" given to the text of Matthew, is extended to many or most other places of Scripture, where the word "sinners" is to be found, is particularly worthy of notice. For here we have no longer a gloss upon one passage, but we find laid down a general canon of dogmatical interpretation extending to all the sacred books, a canon as false as it is blasphemous, if there be any truth at all in the revelation of the New Testament, and in the perpetual teaching of the Church, to whose care that revelation was intrusted by her Divine Founder. According to our evangelist of Geneva, there is no such necessity of frightening sinners as some pious, silly folks imagine. We should not fear God's anger, where He has not intimated it, nor His threats, where He has made none. Divine vengeance does not await those who sin now and again, out of weakness or passion, but only those whose wickedness is without bounds, and who make it their calling and business to offend God. In other words the *amateur* sinner runs no risk. It is only the *professional* sinner who may expect condemnation. This would seem clear enough, but Beza is yet more explicit. In another edition, he changed the words above mentioned to "qui facitis iniquitatem," but added a note to show the world that though the clamor of friends and enemies had made a change in his rendering, it had by no means made him change

<sup>1</sup> This little scrap of Hebrew erudition volunteered by some of his associates (for he himself knew nothing of the language), is out of place. For *pahal* (like *asa*) with *aven* may mean "to do" what is wrong, as well as "to be engaged in the practice" of sin.

<sup>2</sup> In Walæus's ed. of Beza's version, p. 76, "That is (by a Hebrew idiom, *poale aven*), given over to wickedness and shameful crimes of every kind, and making of sin, as it were, a calling (or business), just as they say in Latin to practice medicine, or the art of a silversmith. These are they who are called in very many places of the Holy Book ἀμαρτωλοί, that is, sinners."

his opinions.<sup>1</sup> In the note he repeats his shameful comment even, if possible, more offensively than before.

"Dicuntur ergo facere iniquitatem et a Christo rejiciuntur hoc in loco, non qui *uno et altero scelere* sunt contaminati, sed qui hanc velut artem faciunt, ut scelestè agendo vitam tolerant, et Dei nomine abutantur ad quæstum, quo cupiditatibus suis satisfaciant."<sup>2</sup>

Here we have again repeated that it is not one or two or a few sins that call for rejection by Christ, but making of sin one's calling and occupation.<sup>3</sup> Nay, here he goes farther and limits it to the gaining of one's bread and sustenance by sinful life. None then but harlots, highwaymen, pirates and the like are excluded from salvation! It is not so easy to understand the latter portion of the note, unless we take it for a sting of this clerical wasp meant for some of his brethren in the ministry. Or perhaps it is merely an idle fling at Baldwin, Bolsec, Carlstadt, Hesshusius, and other rival theologians, with whom his master and himself were then embroiled. But surely Beza cannot have thought that Catholic and Lutheran theologians, or even hypocrites who traded their Calvinistic ministry, were the only ones to be picked out for damnation on the last, great day.

This latitudinarian doctrine of Beza must have had some motive *from outside*, for he did not find it revealed in the new Gospel of his Genevan master, nor will we take the uncharitable liberty of hinting that it might be a theory constructed in self-defence, a theological Cicero's pleading *Pro Domo Sua*. If we may hazard a conjecture, the explanation must be sought in the character of the times and circumstances in which the Calvinistic party then found itself. The heads of the sect in Geneva had great hopes of bringing the whole of France under their control through Anthony of Navarre, who had good prospects of mounting the French throne, his brother Condé, Coligny, and a great many others of the highest order of nobility, who for some reason or other were disciples of Calvinism. With them were coupled many others of the lower *noblesse*, whose numbers and influence were not inconsiderable. What had led them to take sides with Calvin's faction against their

---

<sup>1</sup> This was Beza's usual fashion. See how he dealt with Acts ii. 27, and how he explained the change, made in deference to complaints of which he did not recognize the justice.

<sup>2</sup> "This passage styles doers of iniquity, and represents as rejected by Christ, not those who stain themselves with *one or two crimes*, but those who make it, as it were, their business to earn their livelihood by evil doing, and make an ill use of God's name in order to gain wherewith to gratify their passions." For the Latin text of these words I am indebted to Dr. Campbell, as it has been omitted by Walæus.

<sup>3</sup> The French Calvinistic version has thoroughly caught Beza's idea, and in two places (Luke xiii. and St. John's Epistle) translates the phrase "*dare operam*" by "*faire le mestier de 'l'iniquite.*"

native land and the faith of their fathers? Was it religious conviction, a love of pure doctrine, or a desire to save their souls? No doubt the sectarian jargon which was current in that day made such explanations both easy and common. But those who gave and those who heard them knew better. Most of these knew little and cared less for the inner difference between Catholic and Calvinist doctrines; and whether they did or not, they were determined that Calvinism should impose on them no yoke of moral restraint which they had refused to tolerate in the church of their baptism.<sup>1</sup> The heads of the Calvinistic party were notorious for their loose lives. Their dissolute behavior was the talk of France, and its echoes resounded in Geneva. Some notice had to be taken of the complaints of those evangelicals who wrote from France. Was Calvinism to be introduced into that country, ushered in at court and protected by libertines? Were the doctrines of pure religion to be championed by men who were far wickeder than those they sought to withdraw from the old religion? On the other hand, if these illustrious champions of the new religion, the Anthonys, Condés, and their titled adherents were rebuked for their licentious lives, might they not resent it? Might it not make them and their noble followers grow cold, or at least lukewarm, in the service of "the Gospel?" The difficulty was felt at Geneva and met after consultation.<sup>2</sup> A letter not only kind and temperate,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Dyer, though not friendly to the Catholic Church, has estimated these converts at their proper value. Speaking of those of the titled classes, he says, "The conversion of many of these, however, must be ascribed to other causes than conviction. Works of religious controversy were but little read in France, and, with the exception of Coligny and a few others, the French nobility had neither leisure nor inclination for such inquiries. Disgust at some real or imagined slight or injury at court was frequently the cause of a resort to Geneva. Something must also be attributed to fashion, a term which may seem strange when used with reference to one of the most precise and rigid forms of Christianity, but which may be justified by the fact that the adoption of Calvinism did not produce any amelioration of morals among the higher classes in France, which remained as lax as ever." *Life of Calvin*, p. 475.

<sup>2</sup> In a private letter to Bullinger, of May, 1561 (and first published in our day by Dr. Paul Henry, from MS. at Berne), Calvin denounces Anthony of Navarre as a slave to his pleasures, and boastfully adds: "I have reprehended him for his conduct, just as I should a private individual of my flock, and Beza has treated him quite as unceremoniously." We do not believe a word of all this. In the first place Calvin's personal character for veracity is not such that we should swallow anything either improbable in itself or exculpatory of his conduct, on the strength of his word alone. His denial of all connection with the Amboise conspiracy, his earlier letters in regard to Servetus, and especially the one to Farel, of February 13, 1546, suppressed by Beza, repudiated and denied by his panegyrists for centuries, but found at last in the Royal Library at Paris, all reveal the amount of trickery and deceit as well as rancor and hate that entered into Calvin's composition. And, secondly, we have before our eyes, in black and white, the letter (lately made known by Dr. Henry) which, conjointly with Beza, he wrote to Anthony's brother Condé. And from the tone and temper of the known letter it is safer to argue that of the unknown than from Calvin's idle boast. See following note.

but even tender, was written to Condé<sup>1</sup> about his mistresses; and Beza took up the New Testament to prove that ordinary profligates might be good Calvinists and in the way of salvation, while nothing short of an extraordinary and superlative degree of profligacy—in fact the making a livelihood out of it, which was a case inconceivable in a prince or nobleman—was required for damnation at the last day!

Beza goes still farther in his comment on Matth. v. 20: *Nisi justitia vestra, etc.*, "Unless your justice abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven." He did not venture to tamper with the text, though no doubt his fingers itched to substitute "sound doctrine" for "justice" (or righteousness) in the Saviour's discourse. He reserved the poison for the commentary. Here are his words:

"*Justitiæ nomine intellige sinceram tum doctrinam tum vitam, cum verbo Dei videlicet, quod est justitiæ vera norma, congruentem. Sed de doctrina potissimum hic agi liquet ex sequenti reprehensione falsarum legis interpretationum.*" Then explaining what is meant by not entering the kingdom of heaven, he adds: "*Id est, indignos fore qui in ecclesia doceatis. Nec enim de quorumvis piorum officio sed de solis doctoribus agit: et nomine regni cœlorum, ut alibi sæpe, non triumphantem (ut vulgo loquuntur) sed adhuc militantem et ministerio pastorum egentem ecclesiam intelligit.*"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Condé is said not to have abandoned one of his numerous mistresses on account of his adopting the evangelical religion. He, like his brother Anthony, sometimes stood in need of admonitions from Geneva; but probably the more decided character of that prince and his indispensableness to the Calvinistic cause, occasioned them to be administered with more reserve and gentleness. There is extant a joint letter of Calvin and Beza to Condé, in which his *foible* is handled very tenderly, and indeed Beza was not exactly the person to lecture on such a topic." Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, p. 498.

By way of specimen Dyer gives in a note the following passage from the letter: "*Nous n'estimons pas qu'il y ait du mal ou Dieu ne soit directement offensé: mais qu'on orra dire que vous faites l'amour aux dames, cela est pour déroger beaucoup à votre autorité et réputation. Les bons en seront offensés, les malins en feront leur risée,*" etc. Was this the style in which St. Paul terrified the unchaste governor at Cæsarea? In the homily of the Genevan evangelist not a word about God's anger and the "judgment to come," not a word of the danger hanging over Condé's soul! In its stead we have a shabby appeal to human respect. "You will lose your influence and good name, and make wicked Papists laugh." The sin itself is softened down from its harsh, true name, and is disguised in the playful parlance of worldlings, as "making love to the ladies." Nay, it is hinted that this is only an *indirect* way of offending God! And we are asked to believe, on their mere word, that these men rebuked the King of Navarre and handled him as unceremoniously as if he were a mere plebeian of their congregation! It would be hard to take their oath for it!

<sup>2</sup> "By the word 'justice' understand a pure doctrine and a pure life; that is, conformable to God's Word, which is the true standard of justice. But from the rebuke that follows, of false interpretations of the law, it is clear that it is a question here of

Never was there a more deplorable backing down (it would be comical if it were not so wicked) than in these comments on one and the same verse. He begins by establishing, against the opinion of the whole world, that Our Saviour's word "justice" means both sound doctrine and pure life. In the next sentence he restricts it *chiefly* to sound doctrine. In the third pure life vanishes altogether, and we are told that it is not uprightness of living, but *only* of teaching, that is commended in the text; and that the kingdom spoken of is not heaven above, but the Church that stands yet in need of sound teaching. Was not this "a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort" for the Bourbons, Condés, and other noble libertines? What need had they of good works or chaste lives when Christ had declared through that "godly man and chosen vessel," Beza, that all the righteousness He expects is *orthodoxy*? And were they not daily intriguing, plotting, fighting, and ready to die for orthodoxy of the most improved pattern, that which was taught in Geneva? Well may Dr. Campbell (though a Presbyterian minister) exclaim: "For my part I have seen nothing in any commentator or casuist which bears a stronger resemblance to that mode of subverting, under pretence of explaining the divine law, which was adopted by the scribes and so severely reprehended by Our Lord."<sup>1</sup>

There are a great many other wilful perversions of Beza against the teaching of the Church in the matter of justification, free-will, good works, and kindred subjects, but to enumerate them all would call for double our space. We may instance Rom. v. 18; xvi. 18; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Cor. vi. 1 out of many, which we must pass over. Let us come rather to the Church, her constitution, hierarchy, and ministry. In the first place, to his credit be it said, he did not attempt to oust the word "church" from Scripture as did the rabble horde of the theologians who established the new religion in England and Scotland. He did not believe that the Catholic Church was the "pillar and ground of truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); yet he allowed her to remain in quiet possession of that glorious appellation, when with a subtle stroke of his pen he might have transferred it to Timothy, as some Protestant interpreters have already done, and the

---

doctrine more than anything else." And on the final words "you shall not enter," etc., he adds, "that is, you will be unworthy to teach in the Church. For he speaks not here of the duty of any kind of pious men, but *only* of teachers; and by the "Kingdom of Heaven," as often elsewhere, he means not the Church triumphant (as they call it), but the Church yet militant and yet in need of the ministry of pastors." For the Latin text of this note I am again indebted to Dr. Campbell (*ibid.*), as Walæus has left it out, and inserted in its stead a very sensible note of Fred. Spanheim. In the same way in Luc. xiii. 41, he replaces Beza's comment by that of Grotius, at whose apostasy he plainly hints, by calling him, "Inter nostros olim numeratus."

<sup>1</sup> Gospels, p. 387.

revision committee may yet do,<sup>1</sup> unless restrained by the conservative element among them. He believed that the Scriptures were all-sufficient to explain themselves, but he did not exactly thrust this doctrine anywhere into his text, as had been done by Junius and Tremellius.<sup>2</sup> He retains in John v. 39 the apparent ambiguity of the Greek and St. Jerome,<sup>3</sup> but in a note decides against the usual Protestant interpretation, and holds that on exegetical grounds it must be rendered "you search" in the indicative mood. Yet in spite of all this Beza could not deny himself the pleasure of foisting into some text or other the Protestant idea of "searching the Scripture." He had succeeded (as he thought) by interpolation, adroit mistranslation, etc., in putting all the newly discovered theories of Calvinism into the mouth of some evangelist or apostle, or with still more wanton impiety into the words of our very Lord Himself. Why should he not do the same good turn for that cardinal doctrine, or rock, on which Protestantism has built itself? We shall say nothing of the way in which he has adjusted or un-

---

<sup>1</sup> Or they may have it transferred to the "mystery of godliness," as Dr. Murdoch does in his translation of the Peshitto, in defiance of all laws of language, but by the magical aid of "Knapp and Griesbach's punctuation."

<sup>2</sup> In the second of Esdras (Neh. viii. 8), we read as follows: "They (Esdras, Nehemias, and the Levite interpreters referred to in next verse) read in the book of the law of God distinctly and plainly to be understood; and they (the people) understood when it was read." The Jews on their return from bondage had forgotten their Hebrew, and spoke only the language of their oppressors. What more natural, then, that out of reverence, the holy books should be read first in the sacred tongue in which they were written, and then read over again in Chaldee, the Levites translating as they read, for there were as yet neither Chaldee version nor paraphrase? It is precisely what the priest does amongst ourselves. He first sings or reads the gospel in the language of the Church, and then turning to the people reads and explains it in the vernacular. And how do these anti Catholic interpreters disguise and pervert this simple fact? By shamefully adding to the text three words of their own, "PER SCRIPTURAM IPSAM." Here is their latter half of the verse: "Exponendo sensum dabant intelligentiam per scripturam ipsam." "Explaining the sense, they caused them to understand by means of the Scripture itself." Who would not infer from this that it is laid down as scriptural usage that Scripture must be made its own commentary, and that the right understanding of it comes from itself? Even if this were true, why put it down as the word of God, when He did not inspire nor Nehemias write it? But this is ever the curse of heresy, to prate about God's word and the reverence due it, but to show none; on the contrary, to tear it to pieces by erasure, interpolation, or other ill treatment that may suit caprice or interest.

Junius and Tremellius did for the Old Testament what Beza did for the New; and it should not be forgotten that all three were guides to our English Protestant translators, those of King James not excluded.

<sup>3</sup> *Ἐμμενίσθητε*; scrutamini. The war-cry of modern heresy is grounded, at best, on a doubtful passage of Scripture. King James's translators, in opposition to their favorite guide, Beza, to the context, and to the voice of all Christian antiquity, translate it as a command, "search." The growing sentiment of interpreters, outside of the Church, is against it. Will this be taken into consideration by the new revisers, or will it be too hard to give up the old Shibboleth? But there are other passages, far more important, that need examination and correction.



derstood the text in 2 Pet. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 16; and Acts xvii. 11, because there he is only one among the crowd of anti-Catholic translators. But in Acts ix. 22, where the Anglican version, with St. Jerome and the Douay Bible, says that Paul confounded the Jews, "affirming (or proving<sup>1</sup>) that He was the Christ," Beza found his opportunity. He translates the single word "affirming" (συμβιβάζων) by three Latin words, "collatis testimoniis demonstrans" (proving by comparing of testimonies), in order to recommend the "searching" and "comparing" of Scripture with itself.<sup>2</sup> Now it is very likely that St. Paul did compare the life and teaching of Our Lord with the prophecies of Moses, David, Isaias, Jeremy, Micheas, Zachary, etc., to show how fully they were verified in Him. But St. Luke says nothing of the kind; and it would be stretching charity to its limit to suppose that Beza innocently took it upon himself to supply the inspired writer's omission.

Catholics reverence divine tradition, because it is God's Word, and His Word, whether committed to parchment or given orally by His apostles, is worthy of the same veneration. But heretics, for very good reasons of their own, hate the Unwritten Word. The Written they can get into their hands by unlawful seizure; and once in possession of what is not theirs, they treat it as they would the spoils of an enemy. They distort and mutilate it as far as they find necessary, and then turn it into a weapon for their warfare. But the Unwritten Word is beyond their reach. From the bosom of Cath-

<sup>1</sup> So in the modern Anglican version; but the old Genevese had "confirming." The Geneva French does not follow Beza, but has simply "confermant." The Italian and Spanish Calvinist versions take after the Vulgate (affermando, afirmando). (Apud Hutter, vol. i. (Acts), p. 102.) Perhaps *instructing* (i. e., enlightening and convincing by authoritative instruction) would be the more appropriate term. It certainly conveys better the Catholic idea of how the Church and her Apostles teach outsiders. And the word in question (συμβιβάζω) was thus rendered by Beza himself in another place (1 Corinthians ii. 16), where all versions, Catholic and Protestant, agree. In the Syriac it is "showing," which simple word Dr. Murdoch, with the pedagogism which marks his entire translation, swells out into "demonstrating." Perhaps he had his eye here, as elsewhere, on Beza's word, "demonstrans."

<sup>2</sup> Beza in a note (edition of Walæus, p. 1120) has endeavored to justify this translation. But the editor, with good sense and impartiality, immediately appends another note from another Calvinist, Ludovicus de Dieu, infinitely superior to Beza in learning as well as honesty, in which all the sophistry of the Genevan interpolator is mercilessly demolished. But Beza's mischief has not died with him. It has been insidiously stowed away in dictionaries to poison the mind of unsuspecting youth and teach them that συμβιβάζω besides its meaning in classical Greek (concilio, coagmento, etc.), signifies, also, "in the Holy Books to teach, instruct, and especially, to prove by comparing passages of Scripture." "In sacris literis est doceo, instruo, INPRIMIS collatis Scripturæ locis probo." (Lexicon Benj. Hederici, sub. v.) Is there not something beyond what is human in this zealous persistent effort to transfer theological venom and falsehood from dusty tomes to the child's schoolbook? And does it not reveal the hand of one, who as Our Lord says, has day and night and through the ages, but one thought, *ut furetur et mactet et perdat?*"

olic unity, whence they have been ignominiously thrust out, it cries aloud and condemns them. If they could only lay hands on it, they would be satisfied; for they could do with it, as with the Written Word, falsify its utterances and, like Satan in the desert, frame out of it weapons against its Author. But they cannot seize it. They must content themselves with hating, deriding, and condemning it. For this purpose they make use of the Written Word, of which they hold unjust possession. The wanton, undisguised malice with which the word "tradition" was used or discarded in translating the text by the apostles of the new religion, and especially those who protestantized the English-speaking world, is positively shocking to the Christian. Wherever *παράδοσις* (traditio) was used in a Catholic sense, they change it to *ordinance, instruction, teaching, doctrine delivered*, or something else. But where it was used in a Jewish or bad sense, they invariably translated it by "tradition." Twice (Col. ii. 20;<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. i. 18) they intrude it into the text, to make it out condemned by the inspired author, where he never even mentioned it. It is true that some of these perversions have been corrected in King James's Bible; but that signifies nothing. Some of them were thrown away, when they had done their dirty work; others were left to continue it. And what amount of thanks we owe to his translators for having eliminated sundry corruptions from their Bible, is a question, which will be discussed hereafter.

In the two passages from 2 Thessalonians, where the Apostle speaks in the Catholic sense, Beza, for "traditions," has in the singular number "doctrine delivered" (*doctrina tradita*). But in 1 Cor. xi. 2 he seems to have forgotten himself, and gives squarely "sicut tradidi vobis, traditiones retinetis." In 1 Peter i. 18, where the original has "your vain conversation handed down from your fathers" (*ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀνηστρωφῆς πατρὸς παραδότου*), it may be remarked that "handed-down-from-your-fathers" is but one word in Greek.<sup>3</sup> Substantially it does not differ from the adjective *πατρικός*

<sup>1</sup> The word *παράδοσις* occurs thirteen times in the New Testament, ten times in the unfavorable (or Jewish) sense, and three times (1 Corinthians xi. 2; 2 Thessalonians ii. 15; iii. 6) in the good or Catholic sense. The Vulgate has it twice (without evil intent, it need not be said) where it is not found in the original, and in another place translates it loosely by *præceptum* (1 Corinthians xi. 2).

<sup>2</sup> In the English Bible of Geneva (1579), "Why . . . are ye led with traditions?" In that of 1562, reprinted by Hutter, "Why are ye burthened with traditions?" They followed and improved on Beza, who says, "Ritibus oneramin." The modern Anglican has "ordinances."

<sup>3</sup> We have no compound in our language nor even in our Teutonic sister, rich as it is, to express this. To match it we must go back to our primitive Aryan tongue and common mother, where by the side of the adjectives *pitrya, paitrika* (*patrius, paternus, πατριος, πατρικος*) they have also *pitri-gamin, pitri-daya, pitri-prapta, pitrargita*, etc., all meaning *father-given*, or *father-derived*, if we had such forms in English. Sometimes we can succeed in imitating them as "God-given" (*Devadattas*).

(*patrius, paternus*), used subsequently by the Apostle when writing to the Galatians (Gal. i. 14).<sup>1</sup> But Beza, to have his fling at Catholic belief, spins it out into "*ex patrum traditionibus accepta*" (received from the *traditions* of your fathers). The Geneva English has it "received by the traditions of THE FATHERS," no doubt, to suggest to the mind of ignorant readers, that here are meant Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and the others whom we call "the Fathers," and to whom we perpetually appeal as channels of Catholic tradition. But it will be said that even the Latin Vulgate has here introduced the word "tradition." We answer in the first place that heretics have never professed or wished it to be supposed that they have translated from the Vulgate, or taken it for a guide. On the contrary, they would have the world believe that they undertook to translate afresh from the original Greek and Hebrew, because the Vulgate had failed to do it properly. Inaccuracy, therefore, in the Vulgate can never be alleged as an excuse for inaccuracy in a Protestant translation. In the next place, the Vulgate was neither undertaken, nor given to the people, to serve as a rule and standard of faith. But heretical versions pretend to be such; and with them literal exactness is (or rather should be, for their practice does not tally with their principle) a matter of primary importance. In the third place the translator of the Vulgate undertook and accomplished his task *in good faith*, with no bad purpose of forcing the text to sanction the doctrines he believed, and to condemn the doctrines he rejected. There is, therefore, an immense difference between our authorized interpreter and the volunteers who translate our Book, a Book that does not belong to them by any right or title, to subserve the interests of their sect or heresy. And we cannot tolerate any attempt on their part to put themselves on a footing with him, or to appeal to his example in their justification.

We have more, much more, to say of Beza's wilful mistranslations on this and other points, which must be reserved for another article.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rendered *paternarum* by the Vulgate, but diluted by Beza, for his own purpose, into "*quas a patribus meis acceperam*."

THE LOGIC OF EVOLUTION.

*The Descent of Man.* By Charles Darwin. Appletons, 1871.

*Evolution and Logic.* By Edward H. Parker, M.D., Poughkeepsie, 1878.

*The Logic of Special Creation.* By Laique. Ibid.

*The Catholic World*, December, 1877, and passim.

- **W**E would gladly believe what LAIQUE implies, that the evolutionists merely prescind from the existence of God and Revelation, and endeavor to find out the origin of things from natural science alone. This is a laudable exercise of reason. Even in our schools of theology, as well as in the *Senior* class of our colleges, as LAIQUE must know, we are practiced in such investigations and prove God's existence and attributes independently of revealed religion; for it can be proved most exactly, LAIQUE's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. That we know it first by faith matters not. We receive a great many truths by faith alone, in fact nearly all that we learn, and it is only the recipients of what is called a liberal education who reduce them, each in his own profession, to their logical basis, and secure the multitude from error. But we have great reason to fear that Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, etc., do not confine themselves to the study of natural history as a department of science, but that they reject, and hold in contempt, other equally or superiorly reasonable sources of truth. They seem to pay no attention to the "common-sense" (to use a technical term) of mankind. Tyndall laughs at prayer. Huxley ridiculed the Mosaic record in his New York lectures, calling it Miltonic, and so on. Now even if man's origin can be traced by the study of comparative anatomy, it is absurd to say that it may not be otherwise known. And it is in the highest degree unreasonable to ignore the teaching of religion, the facts of history, the truths of metaphysics, and the universal tradition of the human race, when these conflict with our theories. Nothing short of mathematical demonstration, or its equivalent, of the truth of a system, would make this course reasonable.

In the first place then we say to LAIQUE that the existence of God is a fact, not an assumption. And no conclusions in any field of scientific investigation may disregard facts in other fields. We think, moreover, that LAIQUE exaggerates the hypothesis of evolution. It is not a universal law. Whatever may be said of geology and chemistry, whereof more further on, evolution cannot be maintained in the moral and intellectual sphere. There is growth, we admit, but this as a rule is succeeded in races and nations, as well

as in individuals, by climax and decay, and absorption or death. The world shows periodicity, rather than constant development. We have not evolved a language comparable to the Latin or Greek, much less the Sanscrit. We do not approach the ancients in sculpture, painting or architecture, nor, perhaps, in mechanics. The Jews leaped from brick-making to a magnificent religious code, and a ritual which reached its climax under Solomon, and has risen and fallen occasionally since, but surely absolute progress has not been verified. Do you say that Christianity is a development of Judaism? We refer you to the fact that Christianity has had splendid phases, and then again depressions at times, though we deny that it was ever lost. Have the law codes of modern Europe approached the perfection of the XII Tables, the "written reason" of the Romans? Have the Chinese improved on Confucius? What process of evolution is shown in the production of Shakspeare? And does our more recent poetry excel his? So, too, as regards Homer, Demosthenes, Virgil, etc. These men are so singular and independent of antecedents that, from analogy, we might conclude in favor of a like origin for the various species of animals, and especially for the noblest, man. Yes, each particular nation, like an individual, grows, matures, decays and dies. Anarchy succeeds republicanism, just as this is born of revolution, and this is begot of tyranny, which is the debasement of monarchy, which is the result of anarchy. These changes are completed in a longer or shorter space of time in each nation or century, but there is no constant evolution of the less perfect into the more perfect. There is continual motion in a circle. So of civilization, the very refinements of which foster the germs that will eventually destroy it. This was very high in Greece and Rome, but it fell and died, and but for the incorporated spirit of Christianity surviving, it would probably not yet be resurrected. This circle is found in geology also. Nebulæ become solid, solids give birth to plants, and so on. But the rock is also worn away by the rain and changed into soil, and into vapor. The plant becomes coal and the coal becomes gases, and the gases are changed again into the rock. The sea is always invading the land, and the land in turn enlarges its bounds, as the sea recedes. Our cemeteries become cornfields: "from human mould we reap our daily bread," and we bury our dead in the gardens of our ancestors. Where is the constant development towards the higher form? So much for LAIQUE'S presentation of the evolution assumption. What we propose, however, is to show how illogical Darwin is, and for this purpose we will criticize the first chapter of his *Descent of Man*, as it summarizes and reduces to a conclusion the substance of the whole work.

Mr. Darwin's conclusion is as follows: "Consequently we ought

frankly to admit their community of descent (of man and other vertebrate animals). To take any other view is to admit that our structure and that of all the animals around is a mere snare laid to entrap our judgment. This conclusion is greatly strengthened, if we look to the members of the whole animal series, and consider the evidence derived from their affinities or classification, their geographical distribution and geological succession. It is only our own natural prejudice, and that arrogance which made our forefathers declare that they were descended from demigods, which leads us to demur to this conclusion."

This "frank" expression reminds us of the candor with which Huxley, in his New York lectures (September, 1877), recommended the admission that there may be worlds, in which two and two are not four! As to the snare laid to entrap our judgment: will Darwin maintain that the apparent motion of the sun around the earth is also a snare? How pleased Colored-Brother Jasper must have been with the Professor's conclusion. Regarding geological succession we will see that this does not help him. Concerning the persuasion of our forefathers that they were descended from demigods: this and the legend of the Golden Age confirms the Bible history of the elevated state in which man first appeared. How does Darwin account for this universal tradition? What right has he to call it arrogance? Its universality gives positive presumption in favor of its truth.

Let us follow the Professor's logic, however:

1. His first argument is drawn from the transmission of certain traits and variations from father to son. "Man varies in bodily structure and in mental faculties." "Such variations are transmitted to his offspring in accordance with the laws which prevail with the lower animals." "Man, like many other animals, has given rise to varieties and sub-races differing but slightly from each other, or to races differing so much that they must be classed as doubtful species." Therefore man is a modified descendant of some pre-existing form. This conclusion is unwarranted. The strict conclusion (admitting the truth of the premises) is, that "men are more or less different from their primitive progenitors," but still are men. The assertion that some of the various races of men must be classed as doubtful species is contrary to fact: no matter how degraded the savage is, we have no difficulty in recognizing him as a man. No experience shows that accidental changes have risen into specific ones. "The oak and the bee and the rose, remain still the oak and the bee and the rose, throughout the accidental variations of ages; although every oak and bee and rose and every leaf on every tree differs in some respect from every other individual of its kind. Who has ever noticed oak leaves changing into maple leaves? If nature ad-

mitted such a change, a thousand indications would point to it. The transition is said by the evolutionists to be gradual, but some of it would always be apparent. We would have around us a host of transitional forms, from the fish to the lizard, from the lizard to the bird, from the bird to the ape, from the ape to the man. Where do we find such transitional forms?" The leap of Mr. Darwin from accidental variations to specific changes is therefore unwarranted, and his argument worthless.

2. Darwin pretends a transition from a lower grade to a higher. "The lower cannot generate the higher: force 10 cannot produce force 20." If we have to admit improvement in animals and plants under man's cultivation and care, this is because man's knowledge and aid causes the advance. Animals and plants left to themselves very soon fall back. And this applies very remarkably to mankind itself. Men neglected, and not elevated by external influences coming from outside and above, may and do degenerate, and become more or less brutal (as we say), but the rise from barbarism to civilization is due to positive and superior causes. History shows and popular legends tell how some greater one came and taught and raised each people, some godlike Orpheus, or sagelike Cadmus, or Moses, or Hiawatha, but we find no warrant for assuming that men ever civilized themselves, though we can easily understand how they may and do speedily fall in manners; much less is it probable that apes improved themselves into men. The story of the man, "who lifted himself by his waistband," out West, is long ago exploded, and were it not for Christianity, men would fall away instead of remaining stationary or advancing.

3. Darwin pretends that "man tends to increase at so rapid a rate, as to lead to occasional severe struggles for existence, and consequently to beneficial variations, whether in body or mind, being preserved, and injurious ones eliminated." Here he bases his argument upon the "struggle for existence:" concerning which we will merely say that it is the best men of the country who expose themselves for the common weal and die, leaving the propagation of the race to the stay-at-homes. War exhausts nations instead of advancing them, and this is true of the victors as well as of the vanquished. Witness the condition of savage tribes always at war with each other! We admit, however, that some races give way before others, but these also in their turn mature and die out. Indefinite progress is not verified. When races die out, others begin the march of civilization, very often with scarce a relic of their predecessors' outfit to start with. A complete return to barbarism is impossible for Christendom, because the Church endures forever: but the nations which possess Christianity rise and fall just the same, and so it will be till the final dissolution, when the whole

human race will die perhaps of inanition, or because the earth will be no longer a fit habitation for man.<sup>1</sup> Besides, "the struggle for existence is greatest in our large cities. Do we find the flower of the race in them?" Is it not the country blood that supplies the city's waste? And "would not the population of the city die out, if it were not for the accessions it receives from the country, where the people grow up apparently without any such struggle?"

4. Darwin maintains that the anatomical similarity of man to lower animals gives traces of a common genetic origin or descent. This argument may be thus stated: "Wherever there is a similarity of bodily structure or development, there are 'traces' of a common origin or descent. But man and other mammals have similar bodily structures and a similar development. Therefore man and other mammals show traces, etc." The first proposition contains the conclusion, and should be proved. Mr. Darwin does not prove it. The second proposition he proves abundantly, and no one ever denied it. His twenty pages of proof are interesting, but superfluous. What we want him to show is that where there is similarity, etc., there are traces of common descent. What wonder is it that man should be like other animals, destined as he is to live on the earth like them, amongst them, and on similar food? If he were totally unlike them, there would be reason for the wonder. There seems to be a very good reason why all the creatures that move upon the earth's surface should be of similar build. This is because they were made to live upon the one same surface, exposed to the same elements which impede motion and tend to destroy life. Man is an inhabitant of the earth like other animals, eating and drinking and moving like them. Why should he not resemble the rest? The same reasoning holds for the similarity in all the creatures that move in the air. The same for those that inhabit the water. Nay, more, there is a very evident reason why each of the great families of creatures should resemble one another. Abstracting from the accidental elements (if indeed there be any of these) which enter into their formation, the air, the land and the water are after all but different forms of one substance, are all composed of the same ingredients. Water may be considered as liquefied air, earth as solidified water. Marble can be melted into the liquid form, and air could be compressed into the solid. The elements composing all these various substances are few and identical. Hence their influence on animal life is similar in whatever

---

<sup>1</sup> We know that certain exceptions are raised to Vico's theory, the perennial existence of the Chinese for instance, and the Jewish people. Exceptions confirm the rule. The day of the Chinese is a long one comparatively. As for the Jews, their continued existence is owing to a special Providence, and as we showed above, neither their history nor that of the Chinese give any aid to the hypothesis of Evolution.



state they may be found, and the living animal which maintains life by overcoming the obstacles they oppose to its motion (life is motion or force), by adopting and assimilating them, and making them its own, requires similar faculties and like formation in whatever department of creation it may be found. We fail to see the force of the Professor's argument. Indeed, "to say that because the bodily structure of man is similar to that of the ape, therefore man is the descendant or co-descendant of the ape, is as uncalled for, as to say that because the bodily structure of the ape is similar to that of man, therefore the ape is the descendant of man." Look where Darwin's logic brings us out! Indeed from what we have seen above (No. 2), it is not unlikely that man left to himself would become more or less brutal, but what ground have we for thinking that a lot of apes could rise into the condition of reasonable beings?

5. Darwin says: "The homological construction of the whole frame in the members of the same class is intelligible, if we admit their descent from a common progenitor, together with their subsequent adaptation to diversified conditions. In any other view the similarity of pattern between the hand of a man or monkey, the foot of a horse, the flipper of a seal, the wing of a bat, etc., is utterly inexplicable." This is not true. The hand and the foot and the flipper and the wing are similar, because the elements in which they move and whose friction they encounter are "generally" (to use a technical term) similar. Moreover, these limbs serve purposes more or less similar for animals formed on the same "general" plan (V. No. 4), for habitation of the same terraqueous globe. Any greater similarity, however, than their respective uses require, between a man's hand and a horse's foot, we confess we do not perceive. Moreover, whoever made the first progenitor of any race, or, in Darwin's hypothesis, of all the races, could surely make others, and still others like them. We think as we have shown that similarity of structure can be accounted for without admitting community of descent. If it cannot, and if we are obliged to admit this conclusion in this particular department of science, then it is left for us to examine whether God, who freely gave laws to nature, has not deviated from them in this matter. If Revelation tells us that He has, then our conclusions from the study of natural history hold no longer, and must be set aside, because they are not essentially true, and however and how long soever they may fit in harmoniously, it is not repugnant that God, in the exercise of his liberty, should have acted otherwise. This is the difference that exists between mathematical and metaphysical conclusions, and those drawn from the contingent sciences. God's free will can influence these, but not those. And no investigator of the origin of things may logically

ignore the First Cause and His Attributes. Here we are at issue with LAIQUE, who says that "the scientist neither affirms nor denies the being of a God, as a scientist." He grants, however, that the being of a God is an assumption that is a necessity to the human mind. If it is necessary, then it is true. We prove God's existence from its necessity. Further, let us admit that "community of descent" makes similarity of structure intelligible; can we therefore conclude that it is the true theory? No. Plato imagined "the heavenly bodies to be under control of intellectual agents, and this made their movements intelligible. A theory may be ingenious, plausible, even satisfactory, but yet not necessarily true. So the similarity of animals is intelligible in the hypothesis of a common progenitor," but this is not the only way of explaining their likeness.

6. Darwin says: "Man is developed from an ovule . . . about the 125th of an inch in diameter, which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals." "How does he know that it doesn't? He admits that the best microscope does not reveal everything with sufficient distinctness, and therefore he argues from effect to cause, and maintains that similarity of diseases and their imparting is a proof of similar organic structure. Very well. Then in like manner we would say: dissimilarity in the final development of two ovules will be a proof that the two ovules are really dissimilar. One ovule constantly develops into a monkey, another constantly into a dog, another into a man. Is it conceivable that the three ovules are identically the same, so as to differ 'in no respect?'" Further: "the wings and feet of birds, no less than the hands and feet of man, all arise from the same fundamental embryonic form." Indeed! "We have two embryos: one develops into hands and feet, another into wings and feathers, yet we are told that they are both the same fundamental form. What is the fundamental form? Who has seen it? What is fundamental, and what accidental in its constitution?—You cannot conclude the fundamental sameness of two ovules otherwise than by their results, and the results constantly show their difference, not their sameness."

7. "Although Darwin has endeavored to convince us (with what success we have seen), that the human ovule differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals, he is compelled by abundant evidence to admit that there is something in man which does not exist in the lower animals, and something in these, which does not exist in him." Men of science have always explained these organic differences by the old philosophic and scientific axiom: like generates like. Animals of different species owe their specific differences to their having issued from progenitors of different species.

This explanation was supported by an induction based on centuries of observation without a single example to the contrary. The professor explains the difference between animals by his theory of rudiments. For example: he places man in the order of four-handed animals, considering his feet as rudimentary or undeveloped hands. So he makes every difference between man and any other species to depend either on the development in man of an organ which is undeveloped and rudimentary in lower animals, or (as in the example cited), on the development in lower animals of some organ which is rudimentary and undeveloped in man. He goes on to account for this rudimentary condition: "The chief agents in causing organs to become rudimentary seems to have been disuse at that period of life when the organ is chiefly used (and this is generally during maturity), and also inheritance at a corresponding period of life." Now this idea of rudimentary organs is an assumption. He does not establish it. Nor does he prove that the absence of certain useless parts (how does he know that any part is useless?) was a real suppression of a pre-existing part. Does history tell of any species possessing parts different from, or other than, the same species to-day? If you except monsters, Siamese twins, four-armed infants, etc., and these exceptions only confirm the rule, it does not. That there should exist in the lower animals organs rudimentary of those developed in man, is consistent with the hypothesis of evolution. But when the reverse is stated, may we not ask: where then is the constant transition from the lower to the higher form? Why isn't man's eye as perfect as that of the lynx? His ear better than the hound's? He would certainly be more perfect, if it were so. Say that he has something better than these: intelligence. But there is no incompatibility between advanced intellect and perfection of sense. The development of the higher faculty does not imply neglect of the lower, but rather more active and perfect use. Mr. Darwin asserts that "not a few muscles, which are regularly present in some of the lower animals, can occasionally be detected in man in a greatly reduced condition." We say that such muscles are not at all in a reduced condition, but in that required by the nature of the individual. "Remnants of the *panniculus carnosus* in an efficient state are found in various parts of our bodies; for instance, the muscles on the forehead, by which the eyebrows are raised." On what ground can this muscle be called a *remnant*? "The muscles which serve to move the external ear are in a rudimentary condition in man . . . The whole external shell (of the ear) may be considered a rudiment, together with the various folds and prominences, which in the lower animals strengthen and support the ear when erect." Where is the proof that such condition is merely rudimentary? "The nictitating

membrane is especially well developed in birds, . . . but in man it exists as a mere rudiment, called the semilunar fold." "How do you prove that the semilunar fold is a mere rudiment, and not a special organism purposely contrived by the hand of the Creator, at the first production of man?" We admit that man's body is still very imperfectly understood. The various and contending schools of medicine certainly show this. And we cannot explain why one sex possesses what seem to be rudimentary parts corresponding to developed ones in the other. *Seem to be:* for we dare not assert that they are not complete and useful parts in themselves. When the Homœopaths and Allopaths and the Water-cure and the Eclectic have agreed amongst themselves on the essential points, regarding man's knowledge of his own body, they may turn their attention to these minor accessories. For the present, however, we cannot allow Mr. Darwin to assume without proof that they are what he claims. And, as he has not proved it, the argumentation based thereupon falls to the ground.

8. Before referring again to the professor's insistence upon geology, the lapse of ages, etc. (No. 10), we may still further illustrate the Logic of Evolution by a quotation from a discourse, delivered by Dr. Draper, at Springfield, Mass., on the 11th of October, 1877. It contains his answer to the question which his school must solve in order to make its doctrine acceptable. "How can we be satisfied that the members of this long series (the succeeding races found in the geological strata) are strictly the successive descendants by evolution from older forms, and in their turn progenitors of the latter? How do we know that they have not been introduced by sudden creations, and removed by sudden extinctions? Simply for this reason: the new groups make their appearance, while their predecessors are in full vigor. They come under an imperfect model which very gradually improves. Evolution implies such lapses of time. Creation is a sudden affair." This solution is not satisfactory. In the first place, the First Cause "could make new groups even while the others still flourished." Agassiz held that God made eight distinct species of men. Then again, according to Darwin (V. No. 7), it is while animals are in full vigor that they transmit their characteristics to their descendants. And besides, if the circumstances of those periods allowed those groups to flourish "in full vigor," those surroundings must have been wanting, which, according to Darwin, induce changes and developments in a race. Indeed the coexistence, asserted by Dr. Draper, of varying groups seems to show that distinct races could have flourished at the same period, as we see them do now, without any need of one being derived from the other. As to the model very gradually improving, the fact is "the most ancient known vertebrates are the

selachians and the ganoids, the highest of all the fishes in structure." (Agassiz, quoted by Dr. Parker, p. 17.) So much for the argument of Dr. Draper, after stating which, he adjured his hearers not to reject evolution.

9. We have not alluded to Mr. Darwin's argument from "sexual selection." We maintain, however, that facts do not support it. Besides, too much is claimed for this principle. The perpetuation of the race appears to be left to its ordinary members, and though it be true, that "*fortes creantur fortibus*," yet, as was said of nations (No. 3), so in families, a climax is verified; and not only are the greatest individuals remarkably unprolific, but their children are very often notoriously inferior, and their stock speedily dies out. Animals improve by crossing of superiorly gifted individuals, it is true, but it is man who makes the selection. We have no authority for the assumption that animals out of the state of domestication have improved on the qualities possessed by their predecessors in all historic time. The reverse is speedily verified, when they return to the wild state. We ourselves, even at our best, dare not maintain our mental or physical superiority to our fathers of the best periods in past ages, and this notwithstanding our superior opportunities for profiting by the "struggle for existence." If any change has taken place, it is very probably for the worse. There are even those, who hold that just as various animal tribes have become exhausted and have disappeared from the earth, so even the human race gradually but surely, and in spite of occasional revivals of bodily and mental vigor, increases in weakness, and will eventually die out. This is asserted by astronomers, as a necessity of their theory that with the gradual extinction of the volcanic fires the earth loses its heat, grows less and less fertile, and will at last be totally unfit to sustain human life.

10. We may advert here to another singular assumption of Mr. Darwin's. When he is asked why, if his theory of gradual transformation is true, no perceptible specific change is noticed in the various races of domestic animals, where man's ingenuity has been brought to play in improving breeds, etc.: why for instance, our household friend, the cat, is clearly "that same old cat," the Egyptians, two thousand generations (of cats) ago, called *Sciau* (shee-ow), a name evidently formed like the *miau* of the Grecians, and the *gnao* of the Italians, in imitation of the same vocal sounds with which we ourselves are so familiar; he replies that this period, in the existence of the feline tribe, is too brief for us to notice the change which, nevertheless, is surely taking place, and appeals to cycles of time. This is appealing to something we know nothing about, and as it is gratuitously asserted, it is as readily denied. If geology, as far as it has progressed, as well as history, shows no

traces of transition, from one species to another in the cat, or any other tribe, where do you base your assumption? How shall we designate the *frankness*, which asks us "frankly" to admit a conclusion grounded on such baseless hypothesis? And yet I but prove myself "a savage" (*Descent of Man*, vol. 2, p. 369), if, after his arguments and the details by which they are supported, I do not believe that man is the "co-descendant with other mammals of a common progenitor!" Yet, as we have endeavored to show, it is on such pillars that the professor raises his edifice of evolution. Would it be too much for us to say that if these be its foundations, it is indeed a "castle in Spain," the "baseless fabric of a vision?" And for such a theory he wants us to reject, even without examination, all historical evidence, metaphysics, the testimony of our senses, the Church, and the inspired word of God!

11. We proposed to deal only with the *logical process* of Darwinism. We say nothing about its repugnance to the conclusions of metaphysics, nothing about the destruction of morality which is a necessary outcome of the system, when it is not content with evolving the body of man from the brutal form, but claims that even his mind and soul are mere developments of corresponding (?) constituent parts of lower animals. But we will notice the concluding paragraph in LAIQUE'S very well formulated exposition of the new theory, and with this bring our remarks to a close. "Some are honest enough to say that, if biological evolution is true, the Bible is not, but as they said the same when cosmical evolution was announced, they may allay their fears, and enlarge their conceptions of Deity, and hold with the evolutionist that God was there in the beginning of this world, and will be in it to the end of it." The truth of the Bible is independent of our philosophical and scientific systems, and "honest" people will acknowledge, when they witness how one of these overthrows and succeeds to another, that their unaided reason is very weak, and that their assurance of the truth of the Bible must be derived from another source. For our part we say, under correction of the Church of God, the infallible interpreter of the Bible, that if the letter of the Mosaic record were the only obstacle in the way of the acceptance of evolution, we do not see why this theory could not be defended, at least as far as the production of Adam's body is concerned. The earth indeed the Lord has delivered up to the disputations of men, but his Revealed Word not so. He has appointed an infallible teacher to guard and interpret it, lest it become for "honest" people a snare and a stumbling-block, instead of a lamp for their feet and a light on their way; and we are blessed in the knowledge that, while the Church does not directly teach geology, natural history, or any other science, she decides when the Word of God is contradicted in their name, and thus indirectly, but just as certainly, secures us from error.

## BOOK NOTICES.

THE INNER LIFE OF THE VERY REVEREND PÈRE LACORDAIRE, O. P. Translated from the French of Rev. Père Chocarne, O. P. New York : P. O'Shea, Agent 1879.

This is a deeply interesting work. We have read it with pleasure, and, we hope, with profit. It delineates the life and character of one who, by the power of his intellect, the eloquence of his lips and pen, and above all by the sanctity of his life, contributed greatly to the preservation and spread of our Holy Faith in France in the midst of the social and moral dissolution that followed after the revolution of 1830, and whose influence still lives, perpetuated in the institutions he was instrumental in calling into existence. Lacordaire was evidently one of those great souls whom Almighty God, foreseeing the exigencies of his Church and the necessities of society, calls into existence, schools, and fits for the execution of His designs in the special work He desires accomplished, and accordingly in Lacordaire's life the hand of Divine Providence is plainly and frequently manifest, interposing, directing, and shaping his destiny.

There are some men whose characters cannot be fully understood, nor the influence they exert be measured simply by the exterior events of their history. They lead *interior* lives, and to understand them correctly and arrive at a correct estimate of their work, we must penetrate behind the veil of mere outward facts, and bring ourselves into communion with the spirit which worked through all they did. Lacordaire was one of these men, and hence the author of the work before us very properly has aimed, and we think successfully, at depicting his *inner* life. In this he has done real service to the cause of truth. For, widely as Lacordaire is known, and highly as his writings are esteemed, the relation he sustained to Catholicity in France, and the important part he performed, we think, is not fully understood. It may not be amiss, therefore, if, availing ourselves of the materials furnished by the volume before us, we devote more space to an exhibit of this, than we ordinarily do to a book notice.

Henry Lacordaire was born in the year 1802. Deprived of his father a few years after, his early education devolved upon his mother, from whom he seems to have inherited his indomitable strength of will, his almost Spartan austerity, his love of a simple and regular life, and his early religious impressions.

At the age of ten he entered the Lyceum at Dijon. Here, made the butt and victim of his school-fellows, he felt "the hand of sorrow, which, whilst it afflicted him, made him turn to God in an earnest decided manner." Unprotected by his masters and abandoned by all, it was his custom, he tells us, to conceal himself under a bench during the hours of recreation, and there "pour out his tears to God, offer to Him his childish troubles as a sacrifice, and by sentiments of piety raise himself to the cross of His Divine Son." Referring in his old age to these troubles, he says: "Brought up by a strong and courageous Christian mother, the sentiment of religion had passed from her bosom into mine like a sweet and virgin milk. Suffering transformed that precious liquor into the manly blood which made me whilst still a child a kind of martyr."

At the age of twelve he made his first Communion, and it was, he says, "my last religious joy, the last ray which my mother's soul was to shed upon me." "It pleased God that I should fall into the abyss of unbelief,

in order that one day I might the better understand the glory of revealed truth."

That such should have been the sad experience of a lad of fifteen is nothing wonderful when we remind ourselves of the irreligious condition of the lyceums and colleges of France at this time. Their professors and students alike were avowed atheists, rationalists, or St. Simonists, and there was really nothing in them to support faith. It is not surprising then that Lacordaire, young in years and experience, unable to answer the arguments and objections opposed to his faith, and possessed naturally of an inquisitive (he defines it an incredulous) mind, should eventually become, like his fellows, involved in skepticism or infidelity.

Having passed through the lyceum at Dijon, he entered upon the study of law, and in due time was admitted to the bar. At an age unauthorized by law, he made his maiden plea, and with such success that he was assured he might rise to the first rank as a barrister, although his oratory was not considered sufficiently forensic. Said M. Legnier, in passing an encomium upon him: "Gentlemen, this is not Patru; it is Bossuet."

But now, however, that this vast field of usefulness lay open before him, he felt disinclined to enter upon it. His studies had been of more use to him than to qualify him for pleading causes and the adjudication of rights. They had opened his eyes to the historic and social evidences of Christianity. "I had grown for nine years in unbelief," he wrote to a friend (he was now in his twenty-second year), "when I heard the voice of God calling me to Himself. If I seek the logical causes of my conversion, I can find no others than the historic and social evidences of Christianity—an evidence which appeared incontrovertible to me so soon as my age enabled me to clear up the doubts which I had drawn in with the very air of the University." . . . "I have reached Catholic belief through social belief; and nothing appears to me better demonstrated than this argument: Society is necessary, therefore the Christian religion is divine, for it is the means of bringing society to its true perfection, adapting itself to man with all his weakness, and to the social order in all its conditions."

His skepticism appears, indeed, to have been all along far more that of the mind than of the heart. There was in him no aversion to religion; on the contrary, he loved "the Gospel for its incomparable morality, and respected its ministers, because of their salutary influence on society." He thus analyzes his character about a year before his conversion, in a letter to a friend: "There are in me two contrary principles, which are always at war, and which sometimes make me very unhappy—a cold, calm reason, opposed to a burning imagination—and the first disenchant me of all the illusions which the second presents. Nobody would commit more follies than I should do on one side of my being, were I not withheld by a habit of reflection which presents things to me in all their aspects. I have played the game of the material interests of this world, and, without having much enjoyed its pleasures or been intoxicated with its delights, I have tasted enough to be convinced that all is vain under the sun; and this conviction comes both from my imagination, which has no limits save the Infinite, and from my reason, which analyzes all it touches. I have a most religious heart, and a very incredulous mind; but as it is in the nature of things that the mind must at last allow itself to be subjugated by the affections, it is most likely that I shall one day become a Christian." "Would you believe it," a year afterwards he writes, "I am every day growing more and



more a Christian. It is strange, this progressive change in my opinions; I am beginning to believe, and yet I was never more a philosopher. A little philosophy draws us from religion, but a good deal of it brings us back again—a profound truth!”

If the fall of Lacordaire into skepticism was ordered by God that he might the better understand the glory of revealed truth, his recall to that truth by means of the historic and social evidences of Christianity must be considered no less providential. The great work and want of the day was to build up and establish modern society, just set free from a state of tutelage. And what use was made of the Church in all this fever of organization and new systems? *Absolutely none*; it was an understood thing that the world could do without her. She had had her day. Men no longer thought it worth while to attack her dogmas, her morality, or her practice; they thrust her aside among old-fashioned worn-out institutions, and judged her unfit to be used in the work of emancipating the future. St. Simonists, Phalansterians, Socialists, Communists, Equalitarians, etc., were all seeking some new basis of society. The laws that had previously governed the family were declared obsolete, and men racked their brains to invent new ones. The old religion had had its day, and there was to be a religion of the future.

It was in the midst of this social confusion, whilst his inquisitive mind was busy analyzing its component parts and tendencies, and seeking to give each its proper interpretation and value, that Lacordaire awoke to the conviction that there can be “no society without religion, no religion without Christianity, and no Christianity without the Catholic Church.”

To place this stone, rejected by the builders, in its proper position in the social edifice, Lacordaire felt was henceforth to be the work of his life. That he might properly prepare himself for its accomplishment, he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, at Paris. Here, although his diligent attention to his studies, his ready submission to authority, his humility and modesty, acquired for him the approbation of his superiors, his want of previous training, his lively and original nature, not yet under much control, his to them singular and original opinions, his repugnance to points of routine, puzzled his directors and made them doubt his vocation to the priesthood and postpone his ordination. His perseverance under every trial to which they subjected him proved the sincerity of his character and resolved their scruples, and he was accordingly admitted to the priesthood, September 25th, 1827.

Having refused the appointment of Auditor of the Rota at the Court of Rome, our young priest accepted the humble post of Chaplain to a convent of the Visitation Nuns, and here, whilst catechizing little children and hearing confessions, he gave himself up to prepare for what he felt was to be the mission of his life. “Strength is only to be found at the source,” he says, “and it is there I must seek it. The road will be long, and the more so as I intend to gather up on my way whatever may serve me to frame an apology for Christianity, which I have in my mind; its outline is not yet clearly defined, but I see that its materials must be furnished by Holy Scripture, the Fathers, history, and philosophy. Whatever I have hitherto read in defence of religion appears to me to be weak and incomplete. Modern theologians invariably take a guide; it is for all the world like a tour in Switzerland; if a celebrated traveller has followed any particular road, every one else must go the same way and neglect paths that would lead to new beauties, which, however, are not yet made historic.”

For some six or seven years after his ordination, Père Lecordaire re-

mained for the most part in seclusion, diligently engaged in his studies. He had during this period prepared and delivered some sermons, composed after the usual conventional models, but had failed in his own estimation and in that of his hearers. The stiff, didactic methods then in vogue were not suited to his vivacious intellect and fancy, which scorned to be bound to the letter of the manuscript, and longed to roam and soar at will amid the realms of truth.

His mission he felt to be among the young. "The young suit me," he writes. "Whenever I have been called up to address them in our college chapels, I have done some good. If ever I am destined to utilize my powers for the Church, it must be in the apologetical style; that is to say, in that form which gathers up the glories and beauties of the history and polemics of religion in order to exalt Christianity in the minds of the hearers, and by this means compel their belief in it."

An opportunity to prove the truth of his opinion was afforded, when having been asked he consented to give a course of religious conferences to the pupils of the College Stanislaus in Paris.

The effect of these conferences was wonderful, beyond all expectation. The attendance upon the first was comparatively small, but upon those succeeding it became so great that the students for whom they had been designed were dismissed to make room for strangers, and the desire to gain admittance was so great, that we are told such distinguished men as Berryer and Chateaubriand did not scorn to gain access to the hall through a window by means of a ladder. At a bound Lacordaire freed himself from the conventional rules that hitherto had regulated the sermon. The old formulas were broken up, and instead of delivering a written discourse in the customary dry scholastic method, he spoke from the fulness of his overflowing heart. "His whole being preached; his eye, like a flame, kindled where it fell, and his voice rang out natural and unrestrained, now piercing, now persuasive, now supplicating, now menacing." "It was not merely the priest that spoke, but the poet, the citizen, and the philosopher—it was the man of the day speaking to men of his own time of the past, and of a religion they believed to be in its last agony; leading them first to admire his talent, and finally to respect his doctrine." The enthusiasm he created in the minds of the youth, the evident sympathy he showed for their ideas, aspirations, and struggles; the novelty of his manner of preaching; the, for them, too great liberality of his views, and above all the remembrance of certain articles from his pen published in the *Avenir*, occasioned considerable alarm in the minds of those who adhered to old traditions, who, failing to see the possibility of any harmony, antagonized, in their minds, reason and faith, science and religion, and society and the Church.

He was denounced to the Government as a fanatical Republican likely to upset the minds of the youths of France, and to the Archbishop of Paris as a preacher of novelties, and a man whose example was dangerous. In obedience to authority the Conferences at St. Stanislaus were suspended, and Lacordaire quietly withdrew into his beloved seclusion and busied himself with his studies, awaiting in patience the time when the seed he had sown should produce its fruits and reveal his true character. "Obedience costs something," he remarked, "but I have learned from experience, that sooner or later it is always rewarded, and that God alone knows what is good for us. . . . *Light comes to him who submits*, as to a man who opens his eyes." He had not long to wait. The influence for good he had acquired over the hearts of the young had

been noticed and won him friends who, unknown to him, were active in demanding his recall.

The pulpit of Notre Dame was now intrusted to him, and in that vast edifice, whose walls proved too small to contain the crowds that assembled to hear his words, he made that apology for Christianity, and for the Catholic Church as its exponent and efficient cause, for which his previous life had been the preparation—an apology most admirably suited to the wants of his own age and also, we may add, to those of our own. "For if," as is well observed by Father Chocarne, "there is any fact to all those who study the signs of the times it is that the evil from which we are suffering is a religious evil, and that the great question to be decided is to know whether man and society can exist without supernatural faith, without any positive communication with God. In this lies the whole struggle of the day. On the one side unbelievers, armed with the powers of reason, with the discoveries of science, and the progress of industry, would exclude from the life of man all Divine intervention and all positive religion, and aim at making humanity shake off forever the yoke of revelation. On the other hand believers labor to make the belief of God once more enter into all the normal conditions of human and social life; but whilst pleading the rights of faith they often exaggerate them and diminish the range of natural reason; they are terrified at the bold investigations of science, and behold with anxiety the conquests of mind over the hidden forces of nature. Hence arises in both parties a mutual antagonism." In passing personally from the darkness of infidelity to the light of faith Lacordaire had experienced no antagonism, and had found no necessity to chain his reason; rather he had enlarged her bounds and given her wider freedom; he had, as he expresses it, only added to his manhood "the God who made him." It was this God, found by him once more after He had been lost, that he felt himself especially called upon to preach to an age that had forgotten Him, but that had felt His absence and was already demanding Him from the voices of nature and from the harmonies of the world. "You thought," said he, "to have cast God from off His throne, and in spite of your mad attempt . . . God is pursuing you without intermission. He is everywhere crossing your road, and presenting Himself in all shapes before your minds. In your philosophical deductions, in your studies of natural science, in your historical researches, in your attempts at social reform, the question of God is always the first to present itself, because it is in fact the first everywhere, and it is as impossible to do without God as it is to change Him. He is to-day what He was yesterday, and what He will be to-morrow. He presses you on all sides and you do not see Him. Like the old Pagans, you raise your altars to the *unknown God*. Now the God whom you seek, without knowing it, whom you invoke in secret, the God of Light, of Science, and of the Future, is He whom I preach to you, the God of the Gospel, Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom alone is life and salvation."

In making this apology for his holy faith he was careful to oppose (and in this lies the secret of his success) no legitimate progress, no praiseworthy aspirations. It was his merit to discern between the truths and the errors of reason, and to combat the latter without denouncing reason itself. He held up to view the negative results of modern philosophy as so many evidences of the insufficiency of reason bereft of God, as so many proofs of the absolute necessity for faith. He recognized the discoveries of science and the progress of industry as the auxiliaries of Divine Truth, as pioneers smoothing the way for the

heralds of the Gospel, and preparing for the unity of the Church under one Shepherd.

He taught society that its troubles proceed from its rejection of religion on the one hand, and its indulgence in unrestrained freedom on the other. But he saw no reason that its acceptance of religion should necessitate the destruction of its freedom. Liberty, like reason and science, he believed to be a blessing, a civilizing power, and not a scourge—a happy consequence of Redemption, and not an enemy of the Church; he asserted that the existence of the people dated from the Gospel—that great charter of freedom—which had broken the chains of the slave and proclaimed the right of all to justice and truth. But whilst he insisted upon this he constantly urged his conviction that “where God is not, the love of liberty can only engender, as history, modern and ancient, attests, anarchy and despotism.”

Such for thirty years was the doctrine taught to France by the religious patriotism of Lacordaire. It has been objected that his conferences were too rational and not addressed sufficiently to the spiritual nature of man, but his mission in his estimation was addressed rather to the masses than to the individual, and accordingly he “aimed to prepare souls for faith,” and in this work he was eminently successful. “If,” says his biographer, “it is insisted on that he never converted any one, we will admit it; it is enough for us to know that he converted public opinion, in other words, the world.” It was not, however, alone by the eloquence of the tongue that Lacordaire was instrumental in leading souls to the threshold of the Church. His name is intimately connected with that of his friend Frederick Ozanam in the formation of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, “that magnificent tree whose branches now extend over the length and breadth of the Catholic world,” and is also inseparably united with the establishment of the Order of Preaching Friars in France, of which he was a member, and over which he presided as Superior to the time of his death.

The piety of Lacordaire was of the heroic order; his chief devotion was that of the Crucifix; his love for penance and humility was excessive, and his entire life a practical exemplification and illustration of his holy faith.

It is needless for us to say that the *Life of Lacordaire*, by Father Chocarne, from which mainly we have drawn the above sketch, is worthy of being studied as well as read.

---

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN. From the German of *Ernst Haeckel*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

This book is in marked contrast with Mr. Darwin's work on the same subject, the “Descent of Man.” The latter naturalist states his opinions cautiously, argues calmly, speaks of religion with respect, is at pains to make it appear that his views do not contradict the immortality of the soul, and, in a few measured words, puts on record his own conviction that “the birth both of the species and of the individual are equally parts of that great sequence of events which our minds *refuse to accept as the result of blind chance.*”

The present work shows no such deference to religion. Its author seems extremely anxious to prove that evolution does contradict all religious teaching; he sneers at Biblical traditions, and goes out of his way to deny the freedom of the will and the existence of anything whatsoever independent of matter and material force—conclusions, we need not say, which would remain entirely unsubstantiated, even were his fundamental theory of evolution satisfactorily proven.

His attempt to demonstrate the non-existence of mind or spirit as a separate substance from matter, not only involves a fallacy, but also shows either a complete ignorance or a gross misapprehension of at least the Catholic philosophy of the subject. It does not follow that mind is a mere function of the brain, because "the former can in no case act without the latter." The intellect does indeed depend *for its object* upon the imagination and memory—in other words, upon the sensitive faculties of the brain; you cannot think without something to think upon, just as you cannot thresh grain unless there is grain present to be threshed. But besides this picture in our imagination, we are conscious to ourselves of another perception, above and beyond the former, an *idea*, which represents its object in a general and abstract manner. Now this idea, simply because it *is* general and abstract, free from all material conditions, must be the act of an immaterial faculty; and this immaterial power we call the intellect. The German professor then falls into a fallacy when he says that because the two things always go together, they are one and the same. Modern physical science thinks it has achieved a vast discovery, when it has shown, as the *Scientific American* puts it, "how dependent is the exercise of the abstractest faculties of the mind on the functions of the body." We would refer our too complacent scientists to the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas (P. I, Quest. 84, Art. 7), where they will not only find this dependence clearly stated, but its exact nature defined, and its complete harmony with the rest of his philosophy demonstrated.

Haeckel's argument from the hereditary transmission of individual mental qualities is of still less strength—in fact, against the scholastic system it is utterly pointless. It is by no means necessary that "as every man inherits certain individual mental qualities from each parent, we must suppose that portions of the mind of each were transferred to the germ at the time of its procreation." If the understanding depends, as we have said, for the object of its cognition upon the imaginative and memorative powers of the brain, it becomes evident that according as these faculties are more or less perfect, the object will be presented with greater or less readiness, precision, and vividness to the mind, and accordingly its perception will be more or less rapid and profound. This fact can be almost palpably tested by any student in geometry. So well was this principle understood by the founders of the scholastic system that they believed the mental differences between man and man to consist, perhaps chiefly, in differences of the imaginative and memorative powers. Moreover, it follows from their principles that, since the soul is the substantial form of the body, differences in the intellectual power itself depend upon constitution of body. "Manifestum est enim," says St. Thomas, "quod quanto corpus est melius dispositum, tanto meliorem sortitur animam. Quod manifeste apparet in his quæ sunt secundum speciem diversa. Cujus ratio est, quia actus et forma recipitur in materia secundum materiæ capacitatem. Unde etiam, quum in hominibus quidam habeant corpus melius dispositum, sortiuntur animam majoris virtutis in intelligendo. . . . Alio modo contingit hoc ex parte inferiorum virtutum, quibus intellectus indiget ad sui operationem. Illi enim in quibus virtus imaginativa, et cogitativa, et memorativa est melius disposita, sunt melius dispositi ad intelligendum." *Summa Theologica*, P. I, Quest. 85, Art. 7.

It is, therefore, plainly evident that the transmission of certain purely physical characteristics by parents is sufficient to determine mental peculiarities in their offspring, without the slightest necessity for supposing "a particle of the father's mind" and "a portion of the mother's mind"

to be communicated to the germ. When Haeckel brings such absurdities as these against Christian philosophy, he succeeds only in showing his own ignorance of *the* philosophy of Christianity. Whatever force this objection may possess against spurious German systems of psychology, it has none at all against the scholastics.

The same may be said of his objection drawn from the gradual mental development of children. Moreover, even leaving out of the question the sensitive faculties, it is manifest that a purely spiritual power, beginning as "tabula rasa," must acquire its knowledge by degrees, and that its conceptions must broaden and deepen, day by day, as the bounds of the child's experience enlarge.

St. George Mivart says of Mr. Darwin's endeavor to show that there is no difference in *kind* between man's intellectual and moral faculties and the psychical powers of brutes: "In this endeavor he fails utterly. The result is, that Man (the totality of his nature, and not his anatomy only being considered) is seen, yet more clearly by this very failure, to differ from every other animal by a distinction far more profound than any which separates each irrational animal from every other."

We may say that Haeckel's effort to extend the same thesis has met with still more signal failure, while the tone of rancor which characterizes the attempt renders the failure more conspicuous. The violent spirit to which we here allude has been strikingly evidenced of late in Haeckel's attack on his scientific *confère* Virchow, who ventured to utter, with reference to evolution and religion, some opinions not sufficiently "advanced" to suit the former professor's peculiar taste. One cannot help regretting that such a spirit should rule, to so great an extent, the feelings of a man whose knowledge of physiological facts is undoubtedly great.

The "Evolution of Man" deals chiefly, of course, with the supposed development of the body of man from the lower animals. It is founded in great measure on the principle that "Ontogeny," or the genesis of the individual, is a repetition in brief of "Phylogeny," or the genesis of the species. Owing to this fact, the book is loaded with minute details of human embryology, which are apt to render it nauseous to the reader of good intentions, and dangerous to any other.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. By *John Richard Green, M.A.* Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1879.

The general characteristics of Mr. Green as a historical writer have become well known. Without the smoothness and polish of style of Hume, or the power of word painting of Macaulay, he surpasses both in terseness and vigor of language, and clearness and directness of narration. He is honest, too, than either, of whom the first was utterly lacking in candor and did not hesitate sometimes to suppress and sometimes to garble important documents, while the second, consciously or unconsciously, had more regard to the effects which he might produce by the manner in which he stated his facts than to their logical connection. From both these faults Mr. Green is free. He means to be fair, and strives to narrate events as they actually occurred. Every important fact in history has, however, a moral significance which depends for its proper exhibition in historical narrative upon the coloring the writer gives it, and the manner in which he links it with other facts, antecedent, concomitant, or subsequent. Here it is that the writer's own opinions, partialities, or prejudices influence him, even when intend-

ing to be strictly truthful; and here it is that Mr. Green's personal opinions plainly affect his manner of viewing and describing events. He is Puritan in feeling, a sincere admirer of its principles, and he could not, if he would, avoid describing the period comprised in this volume, a period in which Puritanism in England played so important a part, in such manner as constitutes a real, though perhaps undesigned, eulogy of the Puritan movement. In saying this, as is evident from our previous remarks, we do not charge Mr. Green with intentional unfairness, or with designedly withholding facts when they go against the interest he evidently is in sympathy with. But it is easy to see that under the unconscious influence of partiality in one direction and of prejudice in the other, he throws into the background some facts while he brings into the foreground others of no greater, and sometimes of much less importance. Thus the faults, the weaknesses, the inconsistencies of the Stuart kings, their unreliability, their vacillations of purpose, and faithlessness to solemn pledges, their arbitrary despotic spirit, combined with want of courage and determination to persevere in the measures they attempted, are all most clearly exhibited. In like manner whatever can tell in favor of their Puritan opponents are prominently brought to view, while whatever tells to their disadvantage, seems either not to be felt by the writer to be worthy of mention, or else are referred to in a way that scarcely attracts attention.

As Mr. Green's personal bias influences his arrangement of facts, so, too, as a matter of course, they affect his estimate of them. He attributes, for example, the resistance made to the arbitrary measures of James and Charles, and the insistence upon the principles of Constitutional Government to the influence of Puritan ideas. He seems to have no knowledge of the fact, or to entirely forget it, that the principles which led to the steady firm resistance of what was tyrannical in the rule of the Stuarts were no original discovery on the part of the Puritans, nor were the Puritans, in fact, steadfast adherents to those principles. Those principles found expression long before in the struggles of the people of England against the tyranny of feudal rulers and the usurpations of the Crown. Those principles the Puritans adopted for a time, and employed as convenient means for overthrowing the house of Stuart; but when they gained the ascendancy they quickly abandoned them and became more tyrannical than the dynasty they overthrew. This Mr. Green seems not to perceive, and hence frankly acknowledging specific instances of the intolerance, bigotry, and domineering spirit of Puritan leaders, he represents them as only exceptional, and not as elements entering deeply into the Puritan character.

In like manner, and from the cause already stated, he fails to do justice to Catholics and the principles to which they held throughout the struggle. The grievous oppressions of Ireland, too, are touched upon very lightly, and the cruelties inflicted upon the Irish people receive only incidental mention. They are referred to as instances of necessary severity, and not, as they actually were, the natural outcome of the ruthless spirit which animated Cromwell and his fanatical adherents and followers.

But while Mr. Green's work is open to criticism on the points mentioned, one must award it high praise on other accounts. Any unfairness in his narrative is, as we have said, undesigned. He does not mean to play the part of an advocate, but of a fair and impartial historian. He is honest in intention and spirit, and to those who can "read between the lines" of his work, and give their real significance to facts from knowledge already acquired, his history will be valuable. It is

clear, concise, graphic, and a valuable contribution to English historical literature.

---

A HISTORY OF THE MASS AND ITS CEREMONIES IN THE EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCH By *Rev. John O'Brien, A.M.*, Professor of Sacred Liturgy in Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmettsburg, Maryland. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1879. 8vo., pp. 414.

We have to thank Father O'Brien for having given us a book that was long needed not only by the more intelligent of the laity, but also by our clergy. The Mass as a sacrifice has been treated of abundantly in books of great learning, and also in popular manuals that are within the reach of all Catholics. But the Mass as a religious ceremony, or complex of ceremonies, is, to a great extent, independent of dogma, and has been made the subject of profound study by very learned men, especially within the last three centuries. These historical and liturgical researches are to be found in large and learned volumes, not a few of them rare and expensive, and not easily accessible to the laity and clergy generally. In the volume before us, Father O'Brien has collected from all these sources what was most necessary and important, and has given the public an interesting and valuable history of the Mass and its rites and ceremonies, whether they be of primary importance, or only secondary and casual. In his preface he modestly disavows any claim to originality: and professes that his work is nothing new, but only a compilation. The author's modesty may commend and enhance his merits; it must not be allowed to disparage them. What he may justly claim as his own, and what is too often wanting in compilers (to use his own modest word), is sound judgment and discrimination in the choice of his sources, making use only of the best; accuracy of statement, bringing forward nothing for which he has not authority; and finally good taste in deciding which of the very numerous minor details were to be mentioned, and which of them should be omitted. Some of them were necessary, and all could not be introduced. He has been very happy in choosing those which were best fitted to interest the reader and illustrate his main subject.

Father O'Brien has done honor to himself and good service to the American Church by his book. It is one that must be productive of much good not only amongst ourselves, but amongst those who are outside of the Church, but honestly seeking after the truth. Besides, it will occupy a deservedly honorable place in an American Catholic literature. Ought it not, therefore, approach as nearly as possible to perfection? We have heard with pleasure that the popularity of the book has been such that another edition has been called for. This would be a favorable opportunity for correcting or modifying at least a few statements, which rest indeed upon some authority, but have been rejected by the best critics. Durandus is admirable in his own sphere, that of liturgy, but we cannot accept him as good historical authority in the assertion for which he is quoted on page 190 (in note). We had rather rely on Benedict XIV or Calmet. See the Dissertation of the latter prefixed to his Commentary on Machabees. So, too, we are willing to leave the "*Epistola ad Messanenses*" (p. 126) where it properly belongs, among matters of pious belief, which one is free to receive or reject. But it would have given a better idea of the great wisdom and discretion that Rome uses in such questions, to intimate that she compelled the Austrian Jesuit (Inchafer) to change the title of his book, "*Veritas Vindicata*," and reduce it to more modest terms, taming down the bold word *Veritas* (Truth) into *Conjectatio* (Conjecture). And thus it appeared in the edition that



was permitted by the Sac. Congr. of the Index: "De Epistola B. M. V. ad Messanenses Conjectatio," etc.

There is another assertion on p. 140 (in note), which we feel sure the reverend author on reflection will not refuse to modify. It is said that St. James the Less was, "according to the most probable opinion," the son of St. Joseph by a former wife, Escha or Salome. Instead of being most probable, it is highly improbable and false. The testimony of St. Jerome, coinciding as it does with the *consensus ecclesiæ* (indeed, St. Peter Damian uses the strong expression, *ecclesiæ fides est*), annihilates whatever there may be of patristic testimony, or opinion rather, to the contrary. Besides, he tells us where they got their opinion, viz., out of the crazy dreams and fictions of apocryphal writers with their imaginary Eschas "sequentes deliramenta apocryphorum et quandam Melcham aut Escham mulierculam confingentes" (in cap. xii. Matt., tom. vii., p. 86. ed. Vallarsi). And in his book against Helvidius, he says of St. Joseph, what the whole Church holds of him at this day, "Virgo fuit per Mariam," that is, because of what was due to her and to the relation between them, one not of their own choice, but established by counsel of the Most High. And it is only proper to suppose (as Baronius aptly remarks) that He who, crying on the Cross, gave her in old age to the care of the Virgin John (Virginem Matrem Virgini commendavit, as St. Jerome says), had been equally mindful of what was due to her dignity, when He was choosing the Guardian of her youth. Baronius says this much better, but writing from memory we cannot give his words but merely their substance.

We hope that the reverend author will accept our few remarks, not as censure, but in the kindly, respectful sense in which they are offered to his consideration. His book is a very good one, and we feel an interest in its being made as perfect as possible.

---

MOONDYNE: A STORY FROM THE UNDER-WORLD. By *John Boyle O'Reilly*. Boston: The Pilot Publishing Company. 1879.

It would be difficult to characterize this book briefly. In outward form it is a fiction, a tale, wild and strange, of more than ordinary interest and told with far more than ordinary power.

The thread of the narrative winds through novel and strange scenes, chiefly in Australia, but also in England. The pictures both of men and of nature are vivid, and drawn with a master's hand. The story is one of wrong and outrage, wrought out in great degree under the forms of law, and of evil and sin fostered by harsh and ill-judged legislation, or by perfunctory, routine and sometimes malicious administration even of just laws. It is a tale, too, of evil overcome by good, and of patient, long-continued, perseverance in working out well-matured plans of benevolence to mankind.

But it demands consideration from another point of view. Fiction, in its purposes, nowadays goes far beyond the mere engaging of the reader's attention in the incidents narrated. It frequently, indeed commonly, aims at inculcating and does inculcate, for good or ill, ideas on every question, religious, moral, political, industrial, social, which men are trying to work out to practical solutions.

This is the case with "Moondyne." It has a most serious purpose underneath the pictures of English and Australian life it presents. Its author is deeply in earnest. He evidently writes not simply or chiefly to entertain, but that he may inculcate his ideas as regards the wrong and misery which he believes have their roots in the structure and adminis-

tration of law, and in the existing condition of society, especially the condition of the poor and the treatment of criminals.

And just here, we think the author has made a mistake and one that possibly may be harmful to some of his readers. Mr. Wyville (Moondyne), the hero of the story, is not a Christian, so far as we can discover from anything that escapes from his lips, or anything related of him. So far as can be gathered from the story, he might be as indifferent to Christianity, not to say ignorant of it, as either of the noble Australian savages whom the author introduces into the story. This, it seems to us, is a mistake. There should, we think, have been some allusion to the source whence the hero drew his marvellous insight into the perplexing problems of society, his patience and calmness, and strength, and power, impossible to humanity, under the circumstances depicted, unless supernaturally aided.

We would not, of course, have had the author to make religion a prominent element in his story, much less lug it in. But the entire suppression of it seemingly as an element in "Moondyne's" character, the entire absence of any connection with it throughout his whole career, seems as strange as would the exclusion of all reference to war in a story whose chief hero was a military conqueror. It gives in fact an air of unreality to "Moondyne," which otherwise he would not have. It may also serve in some minds to foster the mischievous error that humanity unaided by divine grace may rise to the heroic perfection attributed to him.

A like rigid exclusion of religious ideas seems to us to characterize the *philosophy* of the work in its relation to social problems and wrongs. We understand, we think, the writer's motive, and we sympathize with it. He wished to avoid, we suppose, the mistake into which not a few writers of fiction fall, of stuffing their productions with religious discussions. In this he was right, but in his *abstinence* he seems to us to have gone to the other extreme.

The book is issued in handsome style, and will be widely read, no doubt, not only by the talented author's hosts of admirers, but by the thoughtful reading public generally.

---

LOUISA KIRKBRIDE; a Tale of New York. By Rev. A. J. Thebaud, S. J. New York: Peter F. Collier, Publisher. 1879. Large 8vo., pp. 528.

No one who has ever read the admirable works of Father Thebaud on Gentilism and the Spread of Early Christianity would ever have dreamed of his appearing in this new literary *rôle*. Some may have been tempted to lift up their hands in astonishment, if not in holy horror, at the sight of the earnest philosophic investigator of history sitting among the inditers of love-tales, the grave theologian turned novelist! But novelist is no term of reproach; for great and good men are prominent in their ranks. Nor is it essential to the novel that it should be a mere love-story or frivolous in character. And even if the novel appear light and trifling by the side of the scientific or theological treatise, any one who reads this book will readily discover that F. Thebaud is eminently one who knows how to impart both dignity and sterling value to trifles.

Works of fiction are almost a necessity, and it is preposterous to inquire whether of their nature they do more harm than good. Man has in his natural constitution a tendency to relish and enjoy this literature, just as he is naturally drawn to admire eloquence and to be charmed by poetry; and all natural impulses, as a rule, are good in themselves. We

do not deny that our fallen nature, being no longer what God made it, has now some tendencies and impulses that are sinful and wrong, or, to speak with more precision, which may lead to wrong and sin. But God's goodness and mercy are visible even here. For side by side with these impulses, when they rise in the soul, there rises with them a feeling of shame and a foretaste of remorse, that are sufficient to warn us of their true character. But no such baleful shadow waits upon our natural tendency to enjoy fiction. And its marvellous attractions shine out most conspicuously in the age of childhood, when man feels least the effects of Adam's fall. We see it alike in the young heathen (and we have millions of them at home, without going to India or Africa) and in the child who is sanctified by baptismal grace. The question then does not really turn on the innate tendency of fiction to do harm, for no such tendency exists; but on the ill use that writers and readers make of this natural inclination. And then the question is properly narrowed down to this, whether more good or evil results from fiction? It is the same inquiry as that which is made into the proportion of good and evil that follows from the knowledge of reading and writing, or from the art of printing.

This is what Father Thebaud had in view in writing "*Louisa Kirkbride*," which is a pleasant, interesting, and well-written story, even independently of its high moral purpose. His principal aim is to warn Christian families against two dreadful evils, which are the ruin of social, political, and religious life amongst us, and which are not only practiced, but almost taught in our day. One is the cursed love of lucre; the other the abdication by parents of their rights and duties as such, and the consequent absence of domestic education for the children of the rising generation.

We will not spoil the pleasure of our readers by giving an analysis of F. Thebaud's book, as we prefer that they should read it for themselves. We merely call attention to one or more chapters in which the author most graphically and skilfully sketches the causes that led to the memorable fraud of Black Friday—a fraud in which it is said (and we have no hesitation in believing it) that some of the highest officials of the Washington government were partakers and gainers.

---

FAITH AND RATIONALISM, with Short Supplementary Essays on Related Topics.  
By *George P. Fisher, D.D.*, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College.  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway. 1879.

The author of this neatly bound and clearly printed volume informs us in his short preface that it originated in an address which he had been invited to deliver at Princeton Theological School, and that the theme proving attractive to him he was led to add several short Supplementary Essays under the following titles: 1. The Teaching of Theology on the Moral Basis of Faith. 2. The Doctrine of Nescience respecting God. 3. The Doctrine of Evolution in its Relation to the Argument of Design. 4. The Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Prayer. 5. Jesus was not a Religious Enthusiast. 6. The Moral and Spiritual Elements of the Atonement. 7. The Unity of Belief among Christians. These he cast into an appendix which takes up somewhat more room than is devoted to the main subject. At the present time almost any plea for supernatural faith is calculated to win attention from all who feel the necessity of opposing some barrier to the growing Agnosticism and Atheism of the day. We hardly think, however, that Dr. Fisher's book will do much towards strengthening that barrier. Its best argu-

ments have been far more ably presented time and again, when the Rationalistic tendency was less prevalent and less deeply seated than now. While it contains many things of undoubted merit, among which the Supplementary Essays on the Doctrine of Evolution and Prayer may be particularly specified, yet as we lay down the book our feeling is certainly not one of satisfaction; and this, it seems to us, arises in part from its eclectic character. We feel as we read that notwithstanding the eminent authorities cited, did the author deal less in quotation and more in original composition, we would be able to obtain a clearer insight into his meaning. Our misgivings moreover are awakened by a passage that meets us on the opening page of his address. He there tells us that he can "claim to represent no party or school in theology, but feels himself drawn with an increasing conviction to the Catholic truth, which has been the life of Christian piety in all ages of the Church." This, we must confess, strikes us as somewhat vague. It looks like saying that he is an advocate of what is now usually termed "Common Christianity," a creed, the articles of which it is perhaps impossible to define. Our doubts as to the ability of the author to uphold the claims of faith on the ground of "Common Christianity" grow as we read; or rather we cease to have any doubts in this respect at all. It is idle to attempt to combat Rationalism successfully from the position Dr. Fisher has chosen. The liberty to accept or reject whatever does not seem "essential religious truth" is in itself a species of Rationalism. The disintegration of Protestantism, and the lapse of so many of those who once professed it into the abyss of total unbelief, is in the main to be attributed to this principle. If faith is to "overcome the world," it will not be a faith that is fragmentary, even though the fragment seem to embrace all that is "fundamental" in the Gospel. It must be a sincere and unqualified assent to all that is proposed for belief by the one authoritative and infallible Judge and Teacher.

---

CATHOLICITY IN THE CAROLINAS AND GEORGIA, LEAVES OF ITS HISTORY. By *Rev. Dr. J. I. O'Connell, O. S. B.*, A.D. 1820—A.D. 1878. New York: D. & I. Sadlier & Co. 8vo., pp. 647.

The author describes in this volume the growth of Catholicity from humble beginnings in the two Carolinas and Georgia, the labors of its missionaries, the trials and difficulties that surrounded the planting and maturing of the grain of mustard-seed, and much more besides, of which he was an eye-witness, and of which he can say, *quorum pars magna fui*. He gives becoming praise to the heroic exertions and eminent genius of Bishop England, whose life was spent in this arduous field of labor, and to whom it is chiefly due that our Religion obtained a foothold and made some progress in those States. Whatever is, is for the best, and no man should dare to investigate God's counsels. But one is often tempted to speculate, what might have been the difference, had the illustrious bishop been assigned to some great northern centre of Catholic population, where external advantages of every kind would have seconded his unrivalled eloquence and matchless powers of controversy. Nor has the reverend author forgotten those others who labored with and under Bishop England, though in a more limited sphere. Each has his record and in many cases with exuberance of detail.

This is no ordinary book, nor is it a mere historical summary of Religion and its progress in those three States. It is like those old mediæval books, written in the solitude of the cloister by some venerable monk,

intended to be a full and faithful transcript of the writer's mind, embodying the reminiscences of youth and the wise reflections matured by age and repose in the shades of the monastery. Hence we have fact, incident, and anecdote intermingled with considerations on all the great religious, moral, social, and even political questions of the day. His judgments on men and events may not please all. But no reader can deny that they are honestly formed and uttered with candor. Some things perhaps might have received more prominence, while others might have been safely left to oblivion. Of the writer's diligence and accuracy in all important matters, there can be no doubt; and the best proof of it is, that whenever we have found any trace of inexactness, it was only in details, and these few in number and trifling in character. The care and pains with which he has gathered so much material, cannot be sufficiently commended. It must have cost him years of toil and trouble. But then it was with him a labor of love. In this work he has erected a monument to his own memory. From it the future historian will glean much that is valuable. And even in our day, while the remembrance of these events is still fresh in the minds of many, its perusal will instruct and delight a large circle of readers.

---

MODERN CHROMATICS. By *Ogden N. Rood*. International Science Series. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

Few subjects, in the whole range of physical science, present more difficulties in the way of their complete explanation than the familiar phenomena of color. We do not think that these difficulties have been entirely overcome in the volume before us, though something has doubtless been done toward their final removal. With regard to our perception of color, the author adheres throughout to the theory of Young, as developed by Helmholtz and Maxwell. Indeed, this physiological side of the question, together with its relations to art, occupy the work to the partial exclusion of the physical causes of the phenomena. The chapter on color-blindness, the series of experiments on mixtures by means of Maxwell's admirably simple and effective color-disks, and the treatment of the subject of contrast, are, we think, deserving of great praise. To artists the work will be invaluable; to teachers it will also, without doubt, prove useful. It must, however, remain a matter of regret that Professor Rood did not think it within the scope of his work to dwell more at length on the fundamental Physics of his question, and particularly to attempt some simple explanation of the colors produced by Interference, Polarization, and Opalescence. Though he devotes two short chapters to the description of these colors, he gives only the shadow of an explanation of their production. This omission necessarily makes the book somewhat technical in character, and will render it, we fear, for the general reader, of but slender interest and comparatively meagre utility.

The author says: "Light is something which comes from the luminous body to us; in the act of vision we are essentially passive, and not engaged in shooting out toward the object long, delicate feelers, *as was supposed by the ancients*." In this he very probably follows Mr. Tyndall, and as the error seems to be becoming popular, it is necessary that it should be corrected. The Aristotelian Philosophy certainly comprised a large and powerful school among the ancients, and it was the teaching of this school that light is not a body nor a substance of any kind, but an accident transmitted by the luminous body to our eyes by

means of an intervening medium. To this teaching modern science, after some wandering, has been forced to return, and it would be well if it were to admit, more frequently than it does, that Wisdom was not born with it.

---

THE JESUITS: THEIR FOUNDATION AND HISTORY. By *B. N.* London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

This is a most valuable and interesting work.

The members of the Society of Jesus have fulfilled literally our Saviour's prediction: "Ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake." They have borne in silence most injurious accusations, until even from the ranks of their enemies defenders rose up in their vindication, and proved the malice and falsehood of those accusations. The more closely their history is studied, the more plainly appears the wonderful Providence of God in the establishment of this Society, in the persecutions which He permits continually to come upon it, and the manner in which, in spite of jealousy, and hatred, and opposition on every side, it achieves under His protection and aid beneficent results, and renders invaluable services to both science and religion.

The work before us took its rise in an idea of the author to translate Crétineau Joly's *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus* into English. On further consideration, however, he resolved to use the work just named only as a source from which materials might be drawn, and with the assistance of other modern works to "condense a history of the Order into a popular form." A popular history is what the author had specially in view, and in this he has succeeded admirably; for, while care and research have evidently not been spared to make it accurate and reliable, yet everything unnecessary to a clear understanding of the facts and events related is rigidly excluded. The style is simple and clear, and the narrative direct and consecutive.

Commencing with an account of St. Ignatius and his companions, and of the foundation of the Society, its history is traced in Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, Germany, Russia, England, America, the East Indies, China, Japan, Africa, up to the year 1870. It is a work of immense research, and no small amount of labor and of skill must have been expended on it to give as compact and concise, and yet as clear and complete, an account of the labors, trials, and achievements of the Society of Jesus as this valuable work presents.

---

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANCIS OF SALES. Translated from the French of the Bishop of Belley. By *Rev. Joseph M. Finotti.* New Edition. New York: P. O'Shea, Agent. 1879.

The writings of St. Francis de Sales are all useful and edifying. They cannot be too widely circulated or too carefully perused. They are suitable for persons of the most widely different dispositions and in every condition of life. They are peculiarly suitable, too, for the present times, for they are well calculated to correct their prevailing evils, which, though differing somewhat in outward form from those which St. Francis de Sales so successfully combated, yet are, essentially, the same.

This volume is not a work of St. Francis; it was composed by the Right Rev. John Peter Camus, an humble and able, most zealous and devout French bishop; yet it is transfused throughout by the spirit of St. Francis, at whose hands the author received consecration to the office

of bishop, and whom he always looked up to as his master and teacher, and made his model for imitation.

The work before us consists of a succession of brief statements of what St. Francis did or said on an almost infinite number and variety of subjects. They are not didactic in form, but often anecdotes and narratives told in a simple and very interesting way, forming a complete picture of the Saint and of his inner life, his practical methods of combating different evils, his humility, sincerity, penetrating insight into character, sweetness of temper, his zeal and charity. At the same time almost every subject connected with Christian duty, even in what might seem to some trivial details, and almost every form of temptation that assails Christians, is touched upon and explained in a very familiar and simple and attractive manner.

---

LESSONS IN PRACTICAL SCIENCE; OR GENERAL KNOWLEDGE REGARDING THINGS IN DAILY USE. Prepared expressly for Schools and Academies. By the Author of "The Neptune Outward Bound," "The Neptune Afloat," etc. New York: P. O'Shea, Agent. 1879.

This is a very useful work, mainly designed for the class-room, yet at the same time well fitted for home reading in the family circle. It embraces a large number of subjects, such as glass and Etruscan ware, paper, printing, cotton, its growth and manufacture, calico printing, woollen manufactures, carpets, shoddy, silk, india-rubber, gutta-percha, clocks and watches, plated ware, cutlery, metallic and paper money, telegraphy, the telephone, the phonograph, sugar, tea, coffee, chocolate and cocoa, coal and useful subjects obtained from it, gas, etc.

These subjects are all treated of systematically, yet in a familiar and entertaining way. Their history, progress, and present methods of making and employing them are explained, and a large amount of useful and important information is imparted.

The matter is thrown into the form of question and answer, and the questions and answers are so well arranged and expressed, that the dryness of a mere textbook is avoided, and the reader's interest well maintained.

We cordially commend the work as a welcome addition to books suited for the home circle as well as for the school-room.

---

THE ART OF READING. By *Ernest Legouve*, of the French Academy. Translated and illustrated with copious Notes, mainly Biographical. By *Edward Roth*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1879. 8vo., pp. 372.

Many a book is injured by translation from one language into another, and it is counted high praise to say that a translator has succeeded to some degree in rendering the spirit as well as the letter of his original. Mr. Roth was already favorably known as a translator; in this volume he has surpassed himself. He has given us in an English dress all the gayety, lively humor, and sprightliness of M. Legouve. In fact he has improved on the book; for in its translated form it is far more valuable to American scholars than if they possessed the original and could read it fluently. This is owing to Mr. Roth's copious notes, in which excellent biographical accounts are given of all the celebrities of French literature mentioned in M. Legouve's book. As a rule these accounts are models of both critical judgment and comprehensive brevity, and fur-

nish an amount of information that could be found elsewhere with difficulty.

M. Legouve's treatise is by no means merely dry and didactic, as a reader might conjecture from the title; it gives not only more pleasantly but perhaps more effectively all that could be learned on this difficult and important subject from a manual compiled in the usual way for schools or students. We hope that this valuable little book will find many readers amongst our young student class, and even amongst the teaching body, of which Mr. Roth has long been a member and a model, guiding both the young and their teachers not only by word but likewise by example.

---

A GENTLE REMONSTRANCE. A Letter addressed to the Rev. S. C. Ewer, S.T.D., on the subject of Ritualism, being a Review of Dr. Ewer's recent Lectures at Newark (N. J.). By the Rev. *Aloysius Joshua Dodgson Bradley, B.A.*, Pemb. College, Oxford, Missionary Coadjutor at the Pro-Cathedral of Liverpool, formerly Rector of the P. E. (Prot. Episcopal) Chapel of St. Sacrament, New York City. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet. 1879. 12mo., pp. 269.

An admirable little treatise, and one that shows in a very commendable way the controversial skill and keen humor of our old friend, Rev. Mr. Bradley. Knowing all about Ritualism from past experience, he shows up its manifold follies and contradictions. While his argument is able to convince, his style is good-natured to rebuke, without unnecessarily wounding his former conferees. This little work will be read with pleasure and profit by Catholics, but will not be pleasant reading for Dr. Ewer, who holds the singular and most unheard of and anomalous position of a Protestant minister, living by his Protestant pulpit, and yet hating and denouncing Protestantism as the bane of religion and the root of all evil.

---

THE CULTIVATION OF THE SENSES. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother.

This little work is one of a series entitled "Manuals for Teachers," prepared at the request of the Literature Committee of the National Education Society of England, by distinguished teachers. After revision designed to adapt them to the special wants of American teachers, they have been republished in this country. The subjects discussed are "The senses," "How the Child Gets his First Ideas," "How the Child Perceives," "How the Child Forms Conceptions," "How We shall Cultivate the Child's Senses," "Object Lessons," "Lessons on Color and Form," "Subjects of School Instruction."

Without expressing an opinion as to the correctness of some of the principles laid down in this work, particularly as regards the origin of ideas, we commend it to teachers, particularly of very young children, as containing many practical valuable suggestions.

---

MEMORIE DOCUMENTALE PER LA STORIA DELLA RIVOLUZIONE ITALIANA, RACCOLTE DA PAOLO MENCACCI, ROMANO. Vol. I: Parte 1. Roma: Tipografia di Mario Armanni. 1879.

This is the first number of a series of historical documents, bearing on the horrible Revolution that after a preparation of thirty years and more has burst upon the Italian peninsula in our day, destroying the Pope's temporal sovereignty and doing its best to legislate Catholic populations into unbelief. As far as we have looked over the first number it seems very interesting, and we can safely commend it to our Catholic readers, especially since we have heard that our Holy Father, Leo XIII., has approved of the publication. It appears in



monthly numbers, and will be completed in six volumes. The price per year is sixteen francs, and the address is, "Office of the Divin Salvatore, via dei Fornari 214, Roma."

---

LONG LIFE AND HOW TO REACH IT. By *Joseph G. Richardson, M.D.*, Professor of Hygiene in the University of Pennsylvania, Membre Associé Etranger de la Société Française de Hygiene. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1879.

This is one of a series of little books, entitled American Health Primers. Its scope is more comprehensive than some, perhaps, would expect from its title. It treats of the "Causes of Disease, and How to Avoid Them," "Heat and Cold as Causes of Disease," "Contagion, and How to Escape It," "Clothing, and How to Wear It," "Pure Air, and How to Breathe It," "Pure Water, and How to Obtain It," "Baths, and How to Take Them," "The House, and How to Build it, and Live In It," "Food, and How to Digest It," "Impurities of Food and Drink," "Exercise, and How to Take It," "Sleep, and How to Secure It," "Mental Power, and How to Retain It," "Parasitic Enemies," "Old Age and How to Meet It."

---

JESU CRISTO se non è Vero Dio, Vero Homo, diventa il pessimo fra gli empj, inevitabile l'Ateismo, discioglimento della società. Per Monsignor C. Demenico Cerri di Macello. Torino: Tip. e Lit. Camilla e Bertolero. 1879. 8vo., pp. 102.

We have no space now to notice this book, with its revolting, incoherent title, and its often rash, sometimes suspicious assertions. We are not yet decided whether the work be the result of indiscreet, incompetent zeal, or whether we ought to recall our Saviour's words, *ecce manus tradentis me mecum est in mensa* (Luc. xxii. 21).

---

LA NOUVELLE ATALA: Ou la Fille de l'Esprit. Legende Indienne, par Chata-Ima (De la Louisiane). Nouvelle Orleans: Imprimerie du Propagateur Catholique. 1879, pp. 148.

We regret that the late hour at which this book of Rev. Mr. Roquette has come to hand prevents us from doing more at present than simply acknowledge its receipt.

---

ANGLO-AMERICAN BIBLE REVISION. By *Members of the American Revision Committee*. Philadelphia: Am. Sund. School Union. 1879. 8vo., pp. 192.

We shall probably have the opportunity, as we have the intention, of saying something of this book in our next number.

---

THE SOLEMN BLESSING AND OPENING OF THE NEW CATHEDRAL OF ST. PATRICK, New York, on the Feast of St. Gregory VII, Pope and Confessor, May 28th, 1879: containing a full description of the Cathedral, etc. New York: Cath. Publication Society. 1879. 8vo., pp. 69.

GNAD und FREIHEIT: GEWISSEN und GESETZ. Ein Wort zur Lösung zwei interessanter, viel besprochener Fragen. Von *Dr. Aug. Rohling*, Professor der Theologie an der K. K. Carl-Ferdinands-Universität zu Prag. Prag, 1870.

EPIPHANIES OF THE RISEN LORD. By *George Dana Boardman*, author of "Studies in the Creative Week." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879. 8vo., pp. 289.

ESSAYS FROM THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Edited by *Allen Thorndike Rice*. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1879. 8vo., pp. 482.

THE MYSTERY OF THE WIZARD CLIP (Smithfield, W. Va.). A Monograph. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. 1879.

# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

Vol. IV.—OCTOBER, 1879.—No. 16.

---

## THE CANADIAN ELEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

*Les Canadiens del Ouest.* Par Joseph Tassé. Deuxième édition. Montreal, Imprimerie Canadienne, 1878. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xxxix., 364, 423.

*Nôtre Dame des Canadiens, et les Canadiens aux Etats Unis.* Par l'Abbé T. A. Chandonnet. Montreal, Desbarats, 1872. 8vo. 171 pp.

*Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon, during the past Forty Years.* Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet, D.D. Portland, Oregon, 1878. 12mo. 186 pp.

**A**MONG the various elements that have combined to explore, occupy, and develop the vast stretch of the continent over which our flag floats is one singularly overlooked in general estimates, or simply confounded with the direct emigration from the mother country in Europe. This is the Canadian French, which really blends with our history for at least two centuries, and possesses a record to which any race might point with honest pride.

It has at last found an historian who combines extensive and accurate research with constructive ability and eloquence of description.

In the path of exploration led by Champlain and the Religious who followed the rule of the Saint of Assisi or of the grotto of Manresa, the successive generations of native-born Canadians threaded the continent in every direction, bravely bearing their part in all the enterprises called forth by discovery, trade, or war, to develop, strengthen, and defend their native colony. Under their impulse Canada or New France extended not only on French

maps, but, by military posts, missions, and agricultural settlements, as well as by the influence acquired over the Indian tribes, over most of Maine and Western New York, Western Pennsylvania, and all beyond it towards the setting sun, embracing the whole Valley of the Mississippi.

Canadians traversed this inner America "in every direction while it was yet but an immense solitude, still in its wild and primitive beauty." They were the first to cross the Rocky Mountains, and borne on by their adventurous spirit the first to thread their way from the banks of the St. Lawrence to the city of the Montezumas.

Outnumbered and lost as this pioneer element is apparently in the other elements, not even the coarse Anglo-Saxon names have been able to banish from our maps the appellations bestowed by the first Canadian explorers on river and lake, on mountain and bluff, on the desert expanse and the plunging rapid. Vermont cannot disown the sponsors who gave her the name she bears and who christened the streams that flow into the lake, or the island she claims there. New York drew her names of Chateaugay, Ausable, St. Regis, Raquette, Rouse's Point, and Chazy, from no settlers of English stock. Presque Isle, Detroit, Lake Superior, the Upper Lake from Sault Sainte Marie to Fond du Lac, Terre Haute, Des Moines, and Terre Coupée, Mauvaises Terres, with names of saints from the calendar, recall these Canadians, and even generic terms like prairie and portage and voyageur, that we have adopted into our language, do the same, as well as Indian names that in their spelling still show the source from which we derived them, like Erie, Ohio, Illinois, Iroquois, Michigan, Arkansas, Manitou, and Huron.<sup>1</sup>

The patron saint of the Canadian, we know not how or why, is Saint John the Baptist, and in view of the part he has played in traversing the untrod pathways of the land, the choice is not an unhappy one, for the Church in her Itinerary adopts the Precursor as the especial patron of the traveller, introducing the canticle of Zachary, taking from its last echo the antiphon and praying that "by following the exhortations of the Blessed Forerunner John we may come safe to Him whom he preached, Jesus Christ." Not without an appropriate fitness does the land of the voyageurs honor the birthday of this great saint as its patronal feast, and

<sup>1</sup> These names sometimes undergo strange changes. Colonel Meline tells how on his march to New Mexico he reached a stream which his guide called Picket Wire. He knew what pickets were, military and otherwise, and had some idea of the nature of wire, but he could see nothing in the country around to suggest either picket or wire. On inquiry he found that the Canadians styled this stream *Purgatoire*, out of which the American trapper had made *Picket Wire*.

Jean Baptiste designates the Canadian as Patrick does the child of Erin. "To what point of the wilderness," exclaims Father De Smet, "have not the Canadians penetrated?" and Mr. Tassé has wisely taken the words for the motto of his book.

Joliet, Canadian born, threaded the course of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Arkansas, accompanied by Father Marquette; Le Moyne d'Iberville reached the mouth of the river by sea to occupy it and plant the colony of Louisiana, which acquired strength under the guidance of his brother Bienville. Canadians accompanied La Salle to Texas; Juchereau de St. Denys founded Natchitoches, and struck through the wilderness to Spanish posts and reached the city of Mexico, The Canadian Jesuit Baudoin won over the Creeks, among whom he long preached the Gospel. Bissot de Vincennes, born on the St. Lawrence, founded the post that still bears his name, and Varenne de la Verendrye explored the Upper Missouri and the region of the Rocky Mountains to the Valley of the Saskatchewan. Forts were founded at Mackinac and Niagara by the Canadian Marquis de Vaudreuil.

Around Oswego, Niagara, Fort Duquesne, clustered more than a century ago a Canadian population. Detroit was an important settlement of Canadians before English colonization crossed the Alleghanies. Niagara, Fort St. Joseph, Kaskaskia, Mackinac, Fort Chartres, Cahokia, Carondelet, St. Genevieve, St. Philippe, Prairie du Rocher, Vincennes, Sault St. Marie, St. Louis, were all purely Canadian towns, with a regular organization, recognized in official acts, with churches, civil officers, notaries, their hardy population cultivating the soil, carrying on trade, and bravely bearing their part in the various military operations of that long and well-contested war which proved disastrous to France only because France and her profligate king were false to Canada. The most brilliant victory which in that war redeemed the glory of the French name was that won by the Canadian Chevalier de Beaujeu on the Monongahela, the dying moments of that truly Christian hero consoled by the assurance that he had nobly served his native land and that of his ancestors, by the total overthrow of the most finely appointed English army that had yet sought to wrest from France the realm acquired by her Canadian sons.

The Canadian element in Louisiana was large. The first white child born in Louisiana was that of Claude Jausset, a Canadian. Numbers reached it by the way of the Mississippi, and a considerable body of those Acadians whom England tore from their happy homes on the Bay of Fundy as "popish recusants convict" reached Louisiana by way of St. Domingo, and their descendants still form a recognized community on the Teche.

Down to 1763 the part embraced by these French settlements was recognized as Canada and Louisiana, the Illinois country and all south of it being officially part of the latter colony, though really all on the Upper Mississippi was purely Canadian. It was not merely French claim, but English admission. Documents of the last century, in Pennsylvania archives, speak of Fort Duquesne, now Pittsburg, as being in Canada.

The Canadian population thus primitively settled in the West has not vanished or become extinct. As French posts fell during the war many of the people settled near them withdrew, generally to Illinois and Detroit, and when the final overthrow came and the white flag of France was lowered at Fort Chartres by the Canadian St. Ange de Bellerive, more than half the population of Illinois, supposing that the territory west of the Mississippi was still to remain a French colony, crossed the river and founded the first settlements in Missouri, while others descended to Louisiana, but they remained within our present territory. Some discovering their error drifted back, and Illinois remained for years essentially Canadian. So little indeed did the British officers or the settlers on the coast know of the country beyond the Alleghany Mountains, where every stream and trail was familiar to Canadians, that the English force intended to occupy Fort Chartres was in the utmost perplexity how to reach its destination. To march across the unknown country between the coast and the Mississippi was utterly out of the question. Then Major Loftus with four hundred regulars attempted to reach it by way of New Orleans, but was driven back by Indians ambushed on the banks of the Mississippi. Captain Pitman tried to penetrate to it in disguise, but he lost heart and retired. Nor was Lieutenant Fraser more successful, and had to swallow as best he could the malicious condolence of French and Spanish officers at New Orleans, who heartily enjoyed the discomfiture of these English *militaires* seeking to lower the last French flag. It was not indeed till October, 1765, that Captain Stirling, with a hundred of the Forty-second Highlanders, after a laborious and cautious march from Fort Pitt at the head of the Ohio reached Fort Chartres, which was surrendered to him by St. Ange de Bellerive.

Guaranteed in their religious rights by the English Government, the Canadians of the Northwest resumed their peaceful avocations and became the great reliance of the English officers and trading companies in exploring further, negotiating with and managing the Indian tribes, and in developing the resources of the country. This tended to scatter them over the whole Western territory.

During our Revolutionary War this Canadian element was arrayed on different sides. The mission of the Carrolls, Franklin, and Chase to Canada attracted many to the American cause who

had never given their hearty submission to England. Volunteers enough joined the American army to form regiments, and these, after rendering good service during the contest, received, at its close, grants of land in Northern New York, where their descendants are still to be found, the nucleus of the present population of Canadian origin. The Rev. Mr. La Valiniere was so outspoken in his preferences for the Americans that he was expelled from Canada and came to New York.

Detroit was held firmly by the English, who had learned a lesson in Pontiac's War. As far as the power of British arms extended Canadian settlers and Indian tribes were employed on the side of the mother country. In Illinois and Indiana, however, the Canadians welcomed Clark, and under the lead of Rev. Mr. Gibault and Colonel Vigo threw their fortunes into the scale on the side of the Colonies and secured the Northwest to the United States. The debt the country owes these Canadians is by no means a slight one and has never been properly appreciated. In the subsequent operations a Canadian force, taking the field against the common enemy, was almost entirely annihilated.

After Spain declared war against England the Canadian colonists in Missouri had in turn to meet the hostility of the English, and the repulse of the savage foe who attempted to massacre the inhabitants of the little town of Corpus Christi is one of the most striking events in the history of the Revolutionary War.

Ducharme, the leader in this movement against an almost purely Canadian town, was himself a Canadian, and Mr. Tassé sketches his career in one of his volumes.

In this way this Canadian element in the West, which had lost its nationality as French, was scattered among the three contesting nations,—Americans, English, and Spanish,—and as it comprised a host of bold, active men, thoroughly accustomed to Indian and frontier life, this group of French Canadians contributed many who distinguished themselves in the operations of each nation, and not unfrequently Canadian was matched against Canadian.

During our second war with Great Britain there was, to some extent, a repetition of this anomalous state. Canadians on either side of the line took part in the military operations under the flag of England or of the United States, and not a few in the latter country, adhering to old associations and early allegiance, were active in British interests.

The ordinary histories of the United States ignore more or less these Canadian services to our cause, but they are none the less real and important—relatively great at the time and great in their consequences.

When peace was restored an emigration began from Canada,

which has continued, and at times attains great development. In the West the British held for years some of the posts, including Detroit, and in that way exerted an influence which led many Canadians to those parts; and the fur trade, which developed greatly after the purchase of Louisiana, excited competition between a great English trading company and a house in St. Louis, but both parties depended mainly on Canadians as voyageurs, trappers, and employes generally. These men became ultimately settlers from Green Bay to the Columbia. As the United States increased in strength and acquired the trans-Mississippi territory, offering homes and a field for labor to all, Canada, with a rapidly increasing population and fewer advantages, continued to contribute largely to the immigration. At the present time, says Mr. Tassé, "the States which contain the largest bodies of Canadians are Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota." Missouri, founded by Canadians, has retained largely the descendants of the original stock. In Illinois the Canadian race is found chiefly at Chicago, Bourbonnais, Manteno, Petites Isles, St. Anne, Erable, Moméni, and Kankakee. There are about twenty thousand Canadians in Minnesota, and as many in Michigan. In the former State they are found chiefly at St. Paul, the Falls of St. Anthony, Little Canada, Lake Qui Parle, and Crow Wing. Monroe County, Michigan, has eight thousand Canadians, and they are numerous in St. Clair and Macomb counties. In Wisconsin this population is fully as numerous, but is much more scattered. There are also thousands of Canadians in Ohio, Iowa, Dakota, Montana, Colorado, Kansas, Arizona, New Mexico, California, Oregon, and Washington Territory.

In the East, New York and New England have received a large Canadian immigration, and in many of the manufacturing and fishing towns the French Canadians predominate, having their own churches, schools, literary and beneficial societies, as well as their papers, and show an enterprise that is highly creditable.

Little has hitherto been done for the history of this Canadian element. We trace it in the history of the fur trade, in Mackenzie's, Henry's, and Harmon's travels, in Irving's *Astoria*, in the narrative of the Canadian Gabriel Franchère, in the travels of Lewis and Clarke, Pike and Long, in Schoolcraft and Frémont; but it is only in fragments, as the voyageur appears and disappears in the course of the description.

To the Wisconsin Historical Society and the persistent energy of Hon. Lyman C. Draper in collecting the reminiscences of the early Canadian pioneers of that State, is due the credit of drawing attention in this country to the importance of this element, and a proper appreciation of it for anything like a complete history of

our country. The one-sided manner of writing our annals, which belonged to the Cotton-Mather school, and has continued to some extent to our day, of painting the early border wars as mere necessary results of an innate bloodthirstiness of the Canadians, is now relegated to the domain of fables and fairy tales.

Patent on authentic documents stands out the fact that Canada, from the first, repeatedly and persistently sought to cultivate friendly commercial relations with the English colonies, to avoid taking part in any war that might arise in Europe, and to refrain from using Indian auxiliaries in any hostilities that might be forced upon the border colonies in a way that they could not avoid.

The early New England writers, misleading and misjudging, depicted their Mason, Underhill, Church, and other Indian fighters as Christian heroes of the purest type, but portray in colors to make the blood run cold the Canadian partisans—the Hertels, Joncaires, Le Bers, St. Castins, Le Moynes—who reluctantly carried on a system of warfare forced upon them. Writers never sought to learn who and what these men were. The recent studies and publications of Canadian scholars enable us to see many of these men as they really were, and to draw real narratives of events by comparing the sometimes almost irreconcilable accounts, tinged deeply with national and religious preconceptions.

The Canadians distinguished themselves at home and abroad. We are treating of them simply in their relation to the history of the United States and its progress, but we might detail the brilliant career of the Count de Vaudreuil, who by his ability saved the French fleet from destruction off Cape Finisterre, in 1748; Baron Vaudreuil, killed at the siege of Prague; another Vaudreuil contributing to the defeat of Graves, off the Chesapeake; Beaujeus, in the fleet of D'Estaing and in Napoleon's Russian campaign; the Baron Juchereau de St. Denis, winning fame as a military engineer and writer; the Viscount de Lery, whose name is on the Arc de Triomphe at Paris.

What Ferland, Garneau, Daniel, Casgrain, Gaspé, Laverdiere did for the earlier period, the Wisconsin Society began to do for the voyageurs and pioneers of the West. A State historical society, limited in its scope, treated only of the field embraced by its territorial limits, but Mr. Joseph Tassé in his recent work, *Les Canadiens de l'Ouest*, has taken up the whole subject in a series of biographies which embrace the most distinguished of these Western pioneers. Mr. Tassé writes well, and has treated his interesting theme with skill and literary tact. We are not surprised that his work has already reached a second edition. It has all the charm of a romance, and yet he does not exaggerate. He paints his



characters to the life, avowing their faults as frankly as he describes the actions of merit. *The Canadians of the West* must, ere long, be reproduced in English, and will then find a permanent place in our historic literature, far more attractive reading to the general public than most of our local histories.

"Little has hitherto been written," says Mr. Tassé, "on the Canadians of the West. Very interesting works are not wanting on the first explorations in that vast country, or the great discoveries of the Marquettes, Joliets, and La Salles. The manners and customs of our famous voyageurs have also excited the imagination of many novelists,—among others of Cooper, Washington Irving, Jules Verne, Gustave Aimard,—but these writers, whom we may often reproach with inaccuracy, and even with injustice, have scarcely gone beyond the early period. As it always happens the most widespread renown has absorbed the public attention, throwing in the shade other personages, who are none the less important though they are less vaunted.

"Moreover the silence which envelops so many facts worthy of record, so many exciting, even heroic actions, is easily explained. To speak only of our justly renowned hunters and *coureurs de bois*, their exploits have generally been witnessed only by the wild nature around them. Ignorant of the art of writing down their recollections, when they were able to reach their firesides, after escaping a thousand dangers, their ambition aspired no further than to recount around the hearth some scene of their distant wanderings—often more wonderful than a fairy tale.

"These stories have, indeed, been handed down in a few families, where they have entered the legendary form. But how many have become so distorted that it is no longer possible to connect them with tradition. This is a matter of great regret, for what an abundant harvest might have been gathered for Canadian history, which would have been enriched with new dramas of absorbing interest. . . . Historical societies, among whom we must place in the first rank the Historical Society of Wisconsin, have within a few years past made laudable efforts to save from oblivion many of the early Canadian pioneers of the West. The want of authentic information has hitherto prevented the historian from crowning these intrepid men, who have done such honor to the Canadian name on a foreign soil."

His two volumes are an effort to supply the want. Though he has given ten years of research, aided by the labors of friends, especially of Major Mallet, who availed himself of the immense material gathered in the Library of Congress at Washington, Mr. Tassé modestly disclaims having made a complete work. He thinks, indeed, that he has succeeded in shedding some light on

men and events who have been most unjustly forgotten. But our author is far from doing credit to his own labor and literary skill, and we must do him the justice he endeavors to do to others.

The sketches are in chronological order, or nearly so, grouping together those who as contemporaries took part in the same events. The famous Canadians of Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, New Mexico, California, and Oregon are successively treated, the author concluding with the Northwest Territory and Manitoba.

The volume opens with the romantic career of Augustin Mouet de Moras, Sieur de Langlade, who married at Mackinac the sister of an Ottawa chief, and acquired great influence over the Indians of the Northwest. His son Charles led Indian bands in the wars of his time, and took a prominent part in the defeat of Braddock. He led his braves subsequently at Ticonderoga, and fought in the final battle at Quebec, where he in vain implored leave to attack Wolfe before he could form after scaling the heights. Returning to Mackinac, he saw Pontiac seize that post after in vain warning Etherington, the commandant, whom, however, he succeeded in rescuing unhurt from the hands of the savages. When the American Revolution broke out, Langlade, true to his new allegiance, took command of the Western men summoned to fight under the command of General Burgoyne. After the disaster of Bennington the Indians disbanded and Langlade returned to the West, where the fall of Vincennes made further effort useless. Father and son removed to Green Bay, where Charles de Langlade died in 1800. He had served under three flags, French, English, and American, and had taken part in ninety-nine battles and skirmishes.

"But," as Mr. Tassé justly remarks, "his reputation in the eyes of posterity will rest not on his having been an able and intrepid officer. He can claim also the less sounding but no less meritorious glory of having been one of the most intrepid pioneers of the West, one of the first to brave the dangers arising from the fierce natives of that country, by laying amid the wilderness the humble foundations of settlements now thriving and full of promise. This the American population has already recognized by bestowing upon him the glorious surname of Father of Wisconsin."

He never lost the early impression of his religious training, and to the close of his life heartily supported the clergymen, whose number was dwindling away, and endeavored, when possible, to secure their services for the little community that had grown up around him.

John Baptist Cadot was, though a less conspicuous man, the last French and first English commandant at Sault St. Marie, and for years continued to guide the community gathered there.

Very different from these was Charles Réaume, careless and reckless, failing in early life as a merchant in Canada, abandoning wife and home, captured by the Americans on the St. Lawrence, and again at Vincennes, finally settling at Green Bay, where he was appointed judge under the British régime, and continued to wear the ermine under the republican rule, administering justice for nearly thirty years. His knowledge of law, French, English, or American, was not extensive, but in such a border community much was not requisite, and the impartiality of the man and his clear insight into a case suited all who had business before the court much better. The following story is told of him by Mrs. Kinzie: "Two men one day appeared before the judge. Réaume heard patiently the very earnest complaint of the plaintiff, and the no less forcible defence of his opponent. After questioning the witnesses, Réaume rose with dignity, and pronounced the following sentence: 'You are both wrong. You, plaintiff Boisvert, must bring me a load of hay, and you, defendant Crele, bring me a load of wood. The case is settled.'"

Several other Canadian French were invested with the judicial dignity in Wisconsin in those early days, among whom Mr. Tassé mentions Joseph Rolette, James Porlier, Francis Bouthillier, Michael Brisebois, and Nicholas Boivin.

Porlier had studied for the priesthood, but left the seminary to embark for the West. He became about 1820 beyond doubt the most important man at Green Bay. His affable manners endeared him to all, and he had, before ascending the bench, rendered essential service as the first to establish a regular school. He left an unsullied name and a respected memory. He filled the positions of trust to which he was called with understanding and integrity, and the general satisfaction of the public. The better to discharge his duty as a judge he patiently translated into French the laws of Wisconsin.

The sketch of Joseph Rolette shows us another young Canadian who, laying aside his classical works and the severer studies which his father encouraged, left his home on the St. Lawrence for the great West. Although trade carried him to the soil of the United States, he was thoroughly British in his political attachments, and when the War of 1812 broke out, he entered with energy into the military operations of the West. By his advice the forts at Mackinac and Prairie du Chien were wrested from the Americans. After peace was established Rolette settled at Prairie du Chien, where a considerable Canadian population had gathered. Here he embarked in trade, and met with remarkable success, acquiring great influence over the Indians. So jealous did some become that they induced the officer commanding the fort at Prairie du Chien to banish

him to a distant island. John Jacob Astor saw Rolette's ability, and made him his agent in 1820. From that time he was one of the most prominent men of that part. His trading-boats traversed all the rivers and lakes, while he developed the resources of the town, building a saw-mill, encouraging schools, and cultivating vast tracts of land. He was liberal, generous, hospitable, always ready to relieve the poor and aid them to become self-supporting. He was made judge of the county, and took part in the Black Hawk War. Rolette was not only the most active and important trader in that part of the Northwest, but also the most enlightened and best educated man. "His society was eagerly sought by all distinguished travellers who visited Prairie du Chien, for his manners were very courteous, and his conversation very interesting, full of anecdote and wit. His prestige over the Indians only increased as years went by. He was known in every tribe from St. Louis to Lord Selkirk's colony, and from the Wisconsin to Mackinac." The Sioux called him "The King."

The Canadian colony at Prairie du Chien suffered from an unjust decision of the American authorities, by which many were deprived of lands that they had occupied and improved for years. If Rolette was one of the few whose rights were respected, he died poor in 1842, after having done more than any other man to give importance to the place.

Milwaukee, the most thriving city of Wisconsin, with its vast trade in grain, recognizes as its founder the Canadian Lawrence Solomon Juneau. He was not indeed the first settler, having been preceded as early as 1777 by Lawrence Ducharme, and at a later date by Laframboise, Chaput, Grignon, and Beaubien. But the increase of the settlement, the development of its resources, is due to Juneau, who reared his log cabin here in 1818, when the woods were beginning to assume their autumn tints. His energy, activity, and skill won him the confidence and esteem of the Indians, and his post flourished so that other settlers came. When the land was put up for sale in 1830 Juneau purchased one hundred and thirty acres on the riverside north of Milwaukee Street. A town soon started up, Juneau being the first postmaster, and ere long the first mayor. The crash of 1837 checked it, as it did many another rising town, but Milwaukee soon recovered, and kept on in healthy progress. Juneau's house was the first chapel for the Catholic inhabitants, who there gathered around the Rev. Mr. Bonduel. When in a few years he saw the city which he had founded raised by the Holy Father to an Episcopal See he gave Bishop Henni a magnificent site for his cathedral. In the same generous spirit he built a court-house on ground which he gave the city, and laid out a fine park. His liberalities and simple faith, which made him no

match for the unprincipled schemers, at last brought him to the verge of bankruptcy, and Juneau was a ruined man. He sold his property, paid his debts, and retired to Theresa, in Dodge County, where he resumed his old trading life. Still highly respected throughout the State, he was one of the delegates to the Democratic nominating convention in 1856, but he did not long survive. All who knew him loved him. The leading public men of his State expressed their admiration for his character and their regret at his loss. And the Indians, with whom he had been brought into such frequent contact, were more deeply moved than men had ever seen them. They held a council, and ordered all their braves to attend the funeral, a step till then unprecedented. He was buried on a bluff near the Indian agency, but the city which he had founded claimed his remains, and they were transferred to it, and, after a solemn requiem in the Cathedral, honorably interred.

There is no purer or more blameless character in our local history than Solomon Juneau.

In Julian Dubuque we have another of those prominent Canadian colonizers of the West; he not only founded a settlement and began to develop its mineral resources, but has been so well recognized that his name is permanently connected with it. Leaving his home at Three Rivers young Dubuque made his way to the untried West, and soon acquired importance among the Indians. Possessing great powers of sleight of hand and dexterity, he produced effects that amazed the Indians, and threw their medicine-men entirely into the shade. But when they saw him harmlessly handle the rattlesnake and other venomous reptiles, they regarded Little Night as nothing less than a supernatural being of extraordinary power. He became the judge and arbiter of all disputes.

In 1780 Peosta, wife of a Fox chief, discovered a lead mine on the west bank of the Mississippi. Dubuque at once saw the value of the discovery, and proposed to purchase it. At a great Indian Council held at Prairie du Chien, in 1788, he succeeded in obtaining from them a grant of a tract extending seven leagues along the river, and running back three leagues. They sold and abandoned it to Dubuque with full right to work the mines. Well aware that an Indian title would be very precarious, Dubuque resolved to confirm it by every legal form. The west bank of the Mississippi lay in the Province of Louisiana, then subject to the Spanish crown. In 1796 Dubuque presented to Carondelet, the Spanish governor at New Orleans, a petition soliciting a grant of the land in which the mines discovered by him were included. The governor examined the matter, and on the 20th of November, 1796, issued a grant in due form. To develop the Spanish Mine, as it was styled, Dubuque sold part of his tract to the Chouteaus of St. Louis; and when

Louisiana was transferred to the United States, he took care in Harrison's first treaty with the Sacs and Foxes to have his rights recognized by a special clause. He continued to work the mines till his death in 1811, and is spoken of as being the only man who ever induced Indians to work. They buried him with all their savage pomp on a high bluff, and for years lighted at nightfall day by day the funeral lamp at his grave, which became a kind of pilgrimage.

The Canada pioneer and miner was gone; and his rights, which he deemed so carefully guarded, were at once denied, and the United States Government, in defiance of Indian gift, Spanish grant, and American recognition, took possession of the Spanish Mine, leaving only the name of Dubuque to recall the story.

Davenport, in the same State of Iowa, recognizes as its founder the Canadian, Anthony Leclerc, who appears first at Peoria, about 1809, not long before the destruction of that place by the brutal Craig. He then retired to Rocky Island, where he settled, and where Colonel Davenport soon erected a dwelling that outshone the log cabin of the Canadian pioneer. Learned in all backwood lore, familiar with Indian thought and many of their dialects, Leclerc became important as an interpreter and agent. The Sacs and Foxes bestowed on his wife a fine tract of land, and he was more fortunate than Dubuque,—government recognized it, and Leclerc lived to see the city of Davenport grow up there, and to sell the fine house which he had erected for his residence to a railroad company, who transformed it into a station. Leclerc took an active part in all the operations with the Sacs and Foxes, and interpreted from the lips of Black Hawk the autobiography of that chief, which has been published here and in England.

He was for years postmaster and a justice of the peace, with jurisdiction in all mixed cases, where the parties contestant were white and Indian. When a Pioneer Settlers' Association was organized in 1840 he was elected its first president.

Leclerc adhered to his religion, and gave sites for Catholic churches and institutions as soon as a priest began his labors at the spot. He subscribed \$2500, and actually paid a thousand more towards building St. Peter's, now St. Anthony's Church. In 1836 St. Margaret's Church was erected by him and given, with the square on which it stands, to the bishop, a donation worthy of the ages of faith.

The old Canadian town of Detroit has its worthies. In the earlier times Gouin, Navarre, Dejean, and James Duperon Baby. The last of these was a brilliant officer, fighting with his brothers at the head of detachments against the English around Fort Duquesne in 1755, and carrying the terror of the French arms into Pennsylvania and Virginia. Settling after the war at Detroit he embarked in the

fur trade, and became Indian superintendent under the British rule, to which at our Revolution he continued faithful, losing his property. His sons were not unworthy of him, and attained positions of distinction in English civil and military life.

Joseph Rainville is a kind of anomaly. Born of a Canadian father and a Sioux mother, he was educated in Canada under the care of a worthy priest, and always was and professed to be a Catholic. Those who happen to meet *Extracts from Genesis and Psalms, The Gospel according to Mark, Extracts from Matthew, Luke, and John*, in the Dakota or Sioux language, published by Protestant missionary bodies at Cincinnati, would hardly suppose that they were all translated from the French by this Catholic half-breed Rainville; yet such is the fact. His education gave him a knowledge of his own language, and long habit had so imbued him with Sioux that no interpreter in the whole West could approach him. His superiority was so indisputable that the work could not be done without his aid.

His life, however, was one of action, first as a fur trader through Minnesota, Missouri, and the Rocky Mountain district; then Captain in the English service, leading the Sioux at Fort Meigs and other fields, checking their ferocity and cruelty on many occasions, as is well substantiated. Then a half-pay officer, acting in the interests of the Hudson Bay Company; finally, in 1822, renouncing his allegiance, to settle in the United States, where, with Faribault, he founded the Columbia Fur Company, interpreter for Major Long as he had been for Pike, ever active and independent. He finally retired to Lac qui Parle to close his career. There he planted the first wheat-fields and had the earliest herds of cattle and sheep on the Upper Mississippi. His hospitality was that of a patriarch, frank, hearty, and unbounded. Rainville died in March, 1846, and was so esteemed that a county has been named after him.

Louis Provençal, another Canadian, was one of the pioneers of Minnesota, but the most prominent man in that State of the race was John Baptist Faribault, whose brother Bartholomew remaining in Canada rendered such essential service by awakening an interest in the early history of his native colony and collecting many of the rarest and most valuable works relating to it. His catalogue ranks him among our bibliographers. John Baptist, born at Berthier in 1774, attracted the attention of the Duke of Kent by his artistic skill, and received the proffer of a commission, but the service of the Northwest Company seemed to offer greater attractions. His first station was Kankakee. Here and at Baton Rouge, on the Des Moines, he made his first essays as a trader, and with singular success. Still he longed to return to Canada, but was induced to take charge at the Little Rapids. After three years at this post he married a

half-breed girl, and made the West definitively his home. When he had given ten years to the service of the Company he resolved to embark in business as an independent trader, and taking up his residence at Prairie du Chien, established a lucrative intercourse with the neighboring Winnebagoes, Sioux, and Foxes. The lead mined by his countryman Dubuque, and the furs gathered from the Indians were his chief objects of purchase, and these he transmitted by trips lasting a fortnight to St. Louis. When the war broke out between England and the United States in 1812, Faribault refused to take part against the latter. He was accordingly seized by Colonel McCall and carried on a British gunboat. Here he was ordered to take an oar, but spiritedly refused. When the British besieged Prairie du Chien his wife and children fled to Winona, unconscious that he was a prisoner in the hands of the assailants; his house was destroyed by the Winnebagoes, and his cattle and goods carried off. Everything was swept away from him, and after the labor of years he found himself utterly ruined. His courage, however, was unbroken, and he set to work to restore his fortune; but when the English withdrew they set fire to the buildings at Prairie du Chien, and left it desolate.

The Northwest Company, excluded from our territory, was forced to sell its property, and Faribault profited by the occasion. After resuming business for some years at Prairie du Chien he removed to Pike Island, near the site of the future Fort Snelling. Here he began to cultivate largely, and was the first to break ground for agricultural purposes west of the Mississippi and north of the Des Moines. The island, comprising half a square mile, was ceded to him by the Indians, and the title confirmed in a treaty in 1820. Two years later a flood swept the island, destroying all his improvements, and in 1826, owing to an accumulation of ice, the house which he had courageously rebuilt was destroyed and his cattle drowned. Leaving this exposed point he removed to Mendota, where he drove an active trade, acquiring great influence among the Indians, who called him Chapolisnitoy, or Beaver Tail, though on one occasion he was stabbed and severely injured by a lawless brave. In 1817 he met the first priest visiting those parts, and with his family profited by his ministry. In 1840 he found the Rev. M. Galtier in a dying condition at Fort Snelling, and took him to his house, where he lavished every care on him. His house became the home of the zealous priest, for whom he erected a little chapel, the first on the soil of Minnesota, where a congregation of Canadians and Indians soon gathered. This church was dedicated to the Apostle of the Gentiles, and from this fact St. Paul became the name of the new city. The venerable Vicar-General Ravoux succeeded the Abbé Galtier, and always entertained the



highest esteem for the Canadian pioneer, who died in 1860, regretted by all, after giving his children an education such as few sons of the backwoods obtain. His son Alexander became a man of influence, holding positions under the United States in Indian negotiations, and that of legislator in the State which his father aided so well to found. Minnesota has a county and a town of Faribault, and to the Catholic Church there Alexander contributed generously. He laid out Faribaultville, aided by the late General Shields.

Superior City, on Lake Superior, is another place that claims Canadian founders in the persons of John Baptist Lefebvre, Saint Denis, Roy, and Saint Jean.

St. Paul, which owes its name to a Catholic priest, Rev. M. Galtier, honors among its pioneers, the Canadian Vital Guérin, whose generosity to the city and to the Catholic Church was noble. The progress of St. Paul raised him to a position of wealth and importance, but, honest and frank himself, he was no match for the keen unprincipled knaves who swarm in a rising place. His property was swept away, and he died poor after making princely gifts and responding with prompt charity to every charitable appeal. St. Paul reared a monument to this worthy man, and the historian of the city pays the highest tribute to his worth.

Pembina claims among its pioneers Joseph Rolette, Jr., son of one whom we have already mentioned. He represented that place in the Minnesota legislature, and was a man of great enterprise. In all projects for developing the resources of the country he was one of the leaders, and his name is preserved in Rolette County, Dakota.

To an earlier period belongs John Baptist Mallet, who founded in 1777 a settlement on the site of the present Illinois town of Peoria, which was long known as Ville à Mallet. This settlement and Cahokia gave the volunteers for Brady's expedition against Fort St. Joseph, which they wrested from the English, but on the homeward march they fell into an Indian ambushade and were nearly all killed or taken. Undeterred by this, Mallet, in 1778, marched against the same fort, captured it and carried off stores to the value of fifty thousand dollars, effectually crippling British operations in that quarter. Ville à Mallet drew to it the inhabitants of old Peoria, and prospered till 1812, when Captain Craig of the Illinois militia, whose camp had been attacked by Indians, wreaked his vengeance on the inoffensive settlers, plundering their houses, driving off their horses, and destroying their cattle and crops. They themselves were carried off as prisoners, and though set at liberty by Governor Edwards it was only to find their homes

reduced to ashes by the Indians. In vain did they appeal to Congress for indemnity; no redress was ever given.

Pierre Menard, of Kaskaskia, that old town of Canadian origin, was in the last century one of the prominent men of the West. From the year 1786 he was engaged in trade, first at Vincennes as agent for Colonel Vigo, then at Kaskaskia, and as a partner of Manuel Liza, carrying his operations to the Rocky Mountains. As agent for the United States he concluded several treaties with Indian tribes. He was elected to the legislature of the Territory of Indiana from Randolph County, and when Illinois became a Territory took his seat in the legislative council, when it met for the first time, in 1810, in the ancient town of Kaskaskia. Menard discharged the duties of president of the legislative council with calmness, moderation, and dignity. When it was admitted into the Union in 1818 Menard was elected lieutenant-governor and held the office till 1822. He died at Kaskaskia more than a score of years afterwards, universally respected and esteemed. His brother Francis, one of the earliest to run regular lines of transport down the Mississippi, was also a resident of Kaskaskia.

Colonel John Baptist Beaubien, of the Canadian stock of Detroit, was one of the first to form the settlement out of which grew the present city of Chicago, and took an active part in its early progress.

Bourbonnais, in Illinois, one of the great centres of the modern Canadian immigration into this country, regards as its founder Noel Levasseur, a native of Yamaska, Canada, who aided to transport some of the Indian tribes to the West, and was an active Indian agent in the service of the United States.

"Bourbonnais," says Mr. Tassé, "is a real Canadian village, and the traveller who alights unprepared in this spot might well imagine himself in one of the good old Canadian parishes on the St. Lawrence. The church, the college, and the convent grouped together, the houses amid their green farm lands, the frank hospitality of the people, their French gayety and accent, the old national airs that fall gratefully on his ear, the popular customs, so well, in fact, so scrupulously preserved, all remind him of Canada."

Bourbonnais is not the only recently settled spot which is in its origin as Canadian as Kaskaskia, Prairie du Rocher, Peoria, or Fort Chartres, the towns of other days, now gone or declining. Of the new series we find St. George, founded by Granger; Manteno, by Menard Martin; L'Erable, by Mrs. Kirk; St. Anne and Kankakee.

It was at Bourbonnais that the unfortunate priest Chiniquy, who had already given scandal in Canada, openly apostatized and endeavored to draw the good Canadians into his error. The man was soon rated by Protestant bodies at his real value, though they

paid dearly for the experience; and a well-known publication, not friendly to Catholics, depicted, under the title of "Aid for the Chin-capins," the absurdities of this new apostate. Yet he had before his fall directed a considerable Canadian emigration from the Lower St. Lawrence to Bourbonnais, and conceived a project, which he carried out to a certain extent, of uniting all scattered Canadians in this country at that point. The body there in his time reached a population of six or seven thousand.

Joseph Robidou, son of one of the first settlers of St. Louis, planted a cabin, in 1803, at the foot of the Black Snake Hills and began to trade with the Iowas, Foxes, Pawnees, and Kansas, over whom he soon acquired great influence. Robidou's trading-house soon became well known, and having acquired by an Indian treaty with the United States a large tract to repay debts due by the tribes, he invited settlers to the spot and founded the city of St. Joseph, to which he gave the name of his patron saint, and over which he presided as its earliest magistrate.

Another of this Canadian stock, John Baptist Louis Roy, is famous in Western annals for the heroic defence made by him and his wife at Cote Sans Dessein, in 1814, against a large body of Iowas, Sacs, and Foxes. Several Canadians had been lured out by a pretended flight and then cut off. Roy, carrying his aged mother, escaped, with his wife and one companion, to their house, amid a shower of balls. Then the siege began. Mrs. Roy ran balls for the men, and when not thus employed used her own rifle with deadly aim. So rapid was their fire that they had to wet the barrels of their weapons. On the second day Roy's comrade, incautiously looking through a loophole, received a ball which stretched him on the cabin floor, mortally wounded. The Indians soon saw their advantage, and succeeded in setting fire to the roof. Roy climbed up and extinguished the flames, while his brave wife, using every loaded rifle in quick succession, kept the Indians from covering her husband with their fire-arms. The third day dragged on and they were utterly exhausted. Endurance could go no further, but they resolved to die bravely, and opened the fourth day with such a volley from different parts of the house that the Indians, with loud yells, drew off, leaving fourteen of their dead comrades around the desperately defended house.

Louis Vital Bogy, who may be considered a scion of old Kaskaskia, who became Commissioner of Indian Affairs under President Johnson, and who died United States Senator from Missouri, is one of the most distinguished men of this French Canadian element. His education was traversed by an accident which compelled him to limp for many a long day on crutches. Yet with all this drawback he began to study law in 1812, declaring even

then, in a letter to his mother, that the aim of his life was to represent Missouri in the United States Senate, and that he was determined to do so if he had to labor for it till he reached the age of sixty. After studying law and completing his classical studies at Kaskaskia he returned to St. Genevieve, where he purchased a fine property and entered into public life. In 1852 he ran for member of Congress against Thomas H. Benton, and the old statesman secured his return with difficulty, Bogy having carried all the counties except that in which St. Louis was situated. Thus brought prominently to the front, Bogy was soon elected to the Missouri legislature.

He purchased, with others, the Pilot Knob, an iron mountain, and established the Iron Mountain Railway, in order to bring the ore to market. His profession was never laid aside. While engaged in politics and public works of the kind he retained a large practice till the commencement of the civil war, when he was excluded by the oath which fanatics imposed on that State. He ran for Congress in 1863 against Blair, but the terrorism employed defeated him. Three years subsequently he was, as already mentioned, appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and in 1873 was elected to the Senate of the United States, thus attaining the goal which his boyish ambition had fixed.

As Indian Commissioner he redressed some of the chronic injustice of that bureau to the Catholic missions, and in the Senate he was never afraid to avow his Catholicity, his defence of Catholic loyalty against the shameless assault of Senator Edmunds having been clear and noble.

The names we have hitherto cited refer chiefly to the Northwest, but Michael Branamour Ménard, nephew of the lieutenant-governor of Illinois of that name, is one of the heroes of Texan history. He went to Texas in 1829, and as a trader became so influential with whites and Indians that at the period of the revolt from Mexico the new government relied upon Ménard to secure the friendship, or at least neutrality, of the Indian tribes. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention and on the organization of the republic was elected to Congress.

F. X. Aubrey, an adventurous traveller, brilliant in his descriptions, organized an extensive overland trade with New Mexico. His life teems with stirring adventures and perils amid the wild Indians of the plains, but he escaped them all, to be finally assassinated by Major Weightman.

On the same ground the Canadian Leroux acquired no little reputation. California has an energetic Canadian, Prudent Beaudry, who has labored to develop its resources, especially in and around Los Angeles.

When we reach Oregon, first colonized at Wallamette and Cowlitz by Canadians of the Hudson Bay Company, we find among the earliest pioneers Gabriel Franchère, who went out in Mr. Astor's interest in 1810, and reached the Columbia in the following year. Franchère has given, in a volume issued both in French and English, the history of Astoria, and was for many years honored among the merchants of New York, where he lived to the advanced age of seventy-nine. Peter Pambrun and Joseph Larocque also figure among the eminent Canadian pioneers of Oregon.

The Most Reverend Francis Norbert Blanchet, Archbishop of Oregon, and his brother, Bishop of Nesqually, Vicar-General Brouillet, and other clergymen who labored with them in Oregon, are also Canadian pioneers, who are not to be overlooked in the immense good which they accomplished.

In the *Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon*, which we believe we may, without error, ascribe to the venerable Archbishop of Oregon, we trace the Canadian settlers in that State and the adjacent territory, their industry and courage, as well as the fidelity to religion which induced the pioneers to send to St. Boniface to implore a priest from Bishop Provencher, when that apostolic man could only refer them to Quebec. The Rev. Mr. Blanchet responded to that call. As pioneer priest he gathered those distant Canadian settlers around the altar, saying Mass for the first time in Oregon on October 14th, 1838. Peter Chrysologue Pambrun, a pioneer at Fort Wallawalla, Joseph Gervais, Etienne Lucier, Pierre Belegue, at Fort Vancouver, and Simon Plamondon, at Cowlitz, welcomed the priest, and their houses were the first chapels; and many who had been settled in the country from ten to twenty years at last had the consolation of hearing Mass and approaching the Sacraments.

These sketches show us much of the life of the Canadian pioneers of Oregon, and of the progress of religion among them from that time, and their part in building up the national prosperity on the Pacific coast.

E. N. Quimette is now Mayor of Olympia, Capital of Washington Territory. Joseph Perreault is Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction of Idaho, and there are numerous aldermen, sheriffs, etc., etc. Nearly all the Canadians in the United States are American citizens, except the mill operatives in the New England towns.

The biographical sketches of Mr. Tassé thus cover only the West, but the Canadian element, as we have seen, is not confined to the new States and Territories. There has been a considerable increase within the last ten years, but we find in the census of 1870, 493,464 given as the number of natives of British America in

the United States. The returns do not distinguish the French Canadians from the others, but the mass of these immigrants belong to the latter class, and many of them are undoubtedly recorded as French, and in this way not included at all. The French Canadians must constitute one-tenth of the whole foreign population of the United States. The greatest number, 89,590, appears in Michigan, forming 8 per cent. of the population; New York has 79,000; Massachusetts, 70,000, 5 per cent. of the population of that old colony of Puritans and Separatists. Illinois stands next, with 32,000. Vermont, with 28,000, a larger relative proportion than any other State; Wisconsin has 25,000, while Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, California, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Minnesota, and Iowa range from 10,000 to 17,000.

The number of Canadians who emigrated between 1840 and 1850 was 30,000; this emigration followed immediately after the Patriot War of 1837.

Mr. Gagnon, editor of *Le Travailleur*, and other gentlemen, who organized the great festival of Montreal of 1874, the object of which was to organize a movement of repatriation, assert that there are 550,000 Canadians (and children of Canadians who have retained their language, traditions, etc.) in the United States.

Forty thousand Canadians served in the Union army during the War of the Rebellion; about ten entered the Southern army as officers.

This population was almost exclusively Catholic, and, exposed to the sneers and attacks prompted by ignorant bigotry, many became ashamed or indifferent to their religion, especially where they found churches already overcrowded, and the instructions given in a language unfamiliar to them. They missed, too, some of the ceremonies to which they had been accustomed, and did not feel at home. They needed churches of their own, and these they have now erected in various parts where the numbers justified the step, and Canadian priests, trained as many of our own priests have been for years in the Grand Séminaire founded at Quebec by Laval, or at Montreal by the sons of Olier, are laboring among their countrymen in various parts of the United States. They have schools and academies directed by communities, filiations of Canadian bodies, or connected with them. The Clercs de St. Viateur have a college at Bourbonnais; the Jesuits in the State of New York; the Priests of the Holy Cross in Indiana; the Oblate Fathers are connected with Canada, and number many Religious born or educated in that ancient Catholic province. The Sisters of Charity, founded by Madame d'Youville at Montreal, and commonly called Gray Nuns, have among other places houses in Salem and Lawrence, Mass., Ogdensburg and Plattsburg, N. Y., St. Johnsbury, Vt., and an In-

dian mission at Devil's Lake, Dakota. The Sisters of the Congregation of Our Lady, founded at Montreal by the Ven. Margaret Bourgeoys, the process of whose canonization is now actively pursued, have houses at Bourbonnais and Kankakee, Illinois. The Sisters of Providence, of Montreal, have hospitals at Fort Vancouver, Portland, and Seattle, and Indian schools at Fort Vancouver, Fort Colville, Tulalip, and elsewhere. The Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary are found in Vermont and in Florida. The Ursuline Convent of Quebec, founded by the Ven. Mother Mary of the Incarnation, whom we may hope to see soon beatified, has sent members of its ancient community to Louisiana and Texas.

All these bodies give material to complete the picture of what Canadians have done and are doing for the religious and moral as well as the material progress of the country.

The Abbé Chandonnet gives the history of one of these churches in his work, *Nôtre Dame des Canadiens, et les Canadiens aux Etats Unis*. It is a larger work than has yet been devoted to the history of any single Catholic Church in this country, and not only gives the story of the Church of Our Lady of the Canadians at Worcester, Massachusetts, from the earliest effort, by Rev. Mr. Levesque, in 1846, till the successful ministry of Rev. Mr. Primeau, and all he effected, but enters at some length into the various questions concerning this Canadian emigration to the United States and its influence on both countries. We trace the church, beginning in a hired hall, the zealous priest collecting, purchasing a Protestant church, organizing schools, societies, etc., holding fairs, nobly sending a part of the receipts to the beloved Pius IX. and prostrate France. The life of the church, with its struggles of erection and maintenance, is a picture not unfamiliar to us, but as here depicted we enter into the life of the French Canadian colony in New England. Religion is saving these immigrants for Canada and for the United States. In our rougher masses they are exposed to dangers menacing their faith and morals, but the best periodicals of New England recognize the morality of the Canadian factory girl as superior to that of the American, obedience and family ties exercising greater sway.

Not only by their own clergy and religious communities have the Canadians endeavored to preserve their identity, but also by the great modern power, the Press. Among the newspapers of Old Massachusetts are *Le Protecteur Canadien*, *Le Jean Baptiste*, *Le Travailleur*. New York has *La Patrie Nouvelle*; Rhode Island, *Le Courrier Canadien*; Minnesota, *Le Canadien* and *Le Franco-Canadien*; Illinois, *Le Courrier de l'Illinois*; proving that the Canadian element consists of a reading people, and showing energy and activity on their part in meeting the wants of their new position.

To the many ignorant folk of our land who imagine that the Canadians speak a patois unrecognizable by the ear or eye of a Frenchman, it will perhaps be news that the articles in these papers are written with great purity of style and remarkable eloquence and power.

Mr. Tassé, limiting himself to the West, leaves Louisiana untouched; and in that State the Canadian element and the French are so intimately blended that it would be no easy task to trace each separately. Its early founders and governors, d'Iberville, de Bienville, La Motte Cadillac, were Canadians, or long identified with Canada.

Many American officers married into Canadian families in the West and South, and their descendants with English names still pride themselves on the Canadian French stock from which they spring. General Macomb, of the United States Army, was descended through his mother from the Navarres of Detroit. Commodore Barrett, of the navy, claims descent from the family of Jumonville, the Canadian officer killed by Washington on the Ohio.

Canadian blood thus runs through the whole community; and as the immigration from the neighboring Dominion is likely to continue, this element must rise in importance. The last century has wrought many changes, but perhaps in them all none is stranger than the influence of Canada on the United States. Providence seems almost in mockery to have made human schemes and designs result in the very reverse of what men aimed at and strove to accomplish. From the closing decade of the seventeenth century the American Colonies and especially New England strove with all the fury of fanatic zeal to crush Canada. Expeditions went forth headed by ministers, who bore an axe with which to demolish every representation of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" that they could find in the Catholic churches of the French province. The outrages they did commit in cold blood in edifices set apart for divine worship, and which in all international law are respected, are matter of record, and excited then, as they excite now, the reprobation of all sound thinkers. Canada fell at last, weak as she was, not that she did not struggle bravely, but that her vile king abandoned her. Then Providence arrested what seemed inevitable. Catholicity was not overthrown. Canada remained true to the faith, and has remained so to this day. The Colonies in their wrath made this one of the great wrongs for which they raised the standard of revolt. They began the Revolution as ultra Protestants, but requiring aid, put their ultra Protestantism aside to talk the language of liberality and toleration in the presence of the envoys, the army, and navy of Catholic France. The new governments and the new central government have been steadily tending to the point where



the State does violence to the convictions of no man, woman, or child, and enforces no State religious doctrines or systems or standpoints on the citizen.

Meanwhile Catholic Canada is sending her Catholic sons, her priests, her devoted Sisterhoods into this country. New England, which sought with such rabid hate to crush Canada and Canadian Catholicity, now sees her towns swarmed with Canadian Catholics, with churches and convents. Did the early Cottons, and Mathers, and Endicotts, and Winthrops ever dream of such a result? Did they foresee that when their stern unchristian Calvinism had given place to Unitarianism there would be seventy thousand Canadian Catholics in Massachusetts, thirteen thousand in New Hampshire, more than twice as many in the New Hampshire Grants, ten thousand in Rhode Island, and as many in Connecticut, and twenty-six thousand in the district of Maine, living their Canadian life, with church, and priest, and nun, reproducing that hated province on that New England soil which they sought to separate by a wall of fire from all dissent? Catholics of other lands there would be in their eyes bad enough; the despised Irish Catholics bad, very bad; Catholics of New England lineage, and many there be, horrible enough; but nothing, we think, would have curdled the blood of those New England worthies of the early part of last century more than the mere suggestion of the possibility that the day would come when one hundred and fifty thousand Canadian Catholics would quietly seat themselves on the sacred soil of New England!

---

MODERN AND ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY COMPARED.

- Die Philosophie der Vorzeit, vertheidigt von Joseph Kleutgen, S.J., 2 Bände, Münster, 1860.*  
*Dr. Th. A. Rixner's Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie, III. Band, Sulzbach, 1850.*  
*Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie von Dr. Albert Stöckl, Zweite Auflage, Mainz, 1875.*

CATHOLIC philosophy has during the past twenty years more and more returned to the scholastic system. The tenets of the great doctors of the Middle Ages have been expounded and defended in several scientific works; their method has been reintroduced into our institutions and universities; their principles have been again considered as the firm basis of truth. Not only learned men have employed the strength of their intellects, but also the Roman pontiffs have made use of their authority to revive the esteem of scholastic philosophy and to reinstate it in its old domain, the Catholic schools. Pius IX., having condemned many errors which resulted directly from modern systems, and defined several points of Catholic doctrine just as they were taught by the ancient scholastics, declared at last solemnly in the Syllabus (Prop. XIII.), that scholastic theology, and consequently also its foundation, scholastic philosophy, both answers the wants and agrees with the scientific progress of our time. In these days our glorious pontiff, Leo XIII., insists on a still more complete adoption of the tenets of Thomas Aquinas as a principal remedy for the many evils of human society.

But must the return to scholastic philosophy not expose the Catholic schools to the raillery of infidels and generally of those outside the Church? There is no doubt that our age has far surpassed former centuries in the natural sciences. Shall we, then, say that mental philosophy alone has made no progress, and implicitly return to the system of ages decried for their darkness? To prevent or to reject such charges it will be necessary to contrast modern with ancient philosophy. By such comparison we shall discover whether modern has won over ancient philosophy such advantages as ought not to be given up, or has, on the contrary, set forth doctrines which right reason is compelled to object against on account of the false principles they suppose, or the baneful consequences they imply. If the latter is the case, who will blame us for the preference we give to scholastic philosophy?

Modern philosophy is thought by its admirers to have surpassed the ancient systems chiefly in unity. The human mind has never

acquiesced in science not reduced to unity, which is, both in the real and in the ideal order, the last perfection of things. But though this tendency toward unity may be remarked in all scientific researches even from the remotest antiquity, it is, nevertheless, peculiar to philosophy. As this searches into the last and general reasons of things and thus furnishes the full understanding of the principles from which all other sciences start, it is, in the natural order, the science of sciences, and for this very reason takes the leading part in the struggle for unity. Now philosophy, it has frequently been said, should for the sake of unity draw all its conclusions from one first principle by strict deduction; then refer all objects known to one first and absolute being; and at last unfold the connection between the subject thinking and the object thought of. It has often been added that scholastic philosophy has failed in all these respects, since it neither arrived at strict conclusions from one supreme principle, its tenets being but dogmas to be admitted by blind faith; nor joined things known together in intrinsic unity; nor accounted for the transition from the subject to the object. Modern thinkers, on the contrary, are highly praised for having, first and alone, reduced philosophy to one harmonious system perfect in every regard.

All unity of modern philosophy results from idealism, which makes self the centre of all, the source of both cognitions and things. Of it, however, we must distinguish three different stages. First, the way to idealism was prepared by a new speculation, opposed to antiquity; then idealism itself was set forth as a complete system by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; at last, idealism being rejected as a whole, some of its principles and presuppositions were taken as a basis of several modern schools spreading their teachings over the earth in our days. In this essay we shall not speak but of idealism in its strict and proper sense and of those systems giving rise to it.

First we shall expound the doctrine of idealists and their fore-runners, and then criticize them as to unity.

As the very marrow of idealism lies in deriving all from, and reducing all to self, all those systems must be considered as leading to it, which follow a subjective tendency. Now this course of philosophizing is, not without reason, said to have originated with René des Cartes (born at La Haye, in France, in 1596; died at Stockholm in 1650). Of his system, then, we have first to speak. He intended to build up philosophy on a more solid foundation than the scholastics had laid, whom he thought to have based their reasoning on principles not certain at all. He takes his point of departure in universal doubt. "Everybody," said he, "should, once in his life, doubt all things and not admit anything to be

but what cannot be doubted or denied by anybody and thence must be immediately certain." Now, according to his views, we can, for good reasons, doubt the truth of mathematical demonstrations, the very first principles of reasoning, the existence of the world, and even of our own body; because a bad genius may impose them on us by falsifying our cognoscitive powers. Only one thing, the existence of our mind, he thought impossible to be doubted or denied; since without existing we could not even think or doubt. Starting from this one fact as undoubtedly certain he tried to reconstruct the certainty of our cognitions, both intellectual and sensual, by the following course of reasoning. Of our own existence we are perfectly certain, because we perceive it clearly and distinctly. From this we must deduce as the first criterion of all certainty the principle: All is certainly true that we perceive clearly and distinctly. When, now, the mind further reflects on itself, it becomes conscious of its being immaterial, but finite. The idea of the finite presupposes that of the infinite, which cannot be acquired by our reason, since the finite cannot produce the infinite, which must be inborn in it and stamped on it by an infinite power. Consequently, God, the infinite being, exists; for he could not bring forth this idea in our mind without existing, and moreover, the very conception of the infinite implies existence. Now, as God, on account of his infinite perfection, is truth itself, our cognoscitive powers too, having proceeded from him and bearing his likeness, cannot but be true. Thus he arrived at the truth of our senses and our intellect, and infers from it, that whatsoever they clearly and distinctly represent must be also true: viz., the principles of reasoning, the existence of both our body and the material world without us.

On this foundation and from the principles thus established he drew conclusions and developed a philosophical system, which, we cannot deny, were frequently opposed to the tenets of the scholastics and akin to modern theories. He, for instance, defines substance to be a thing which, as to its existence, is in no need of any other being; he places the essence of the soul in thought, and that of the body in extension; he makes the metaphysical truth as well as the existence of finite beings dependent on the free will of God, and consequently maintains that we cannot ascertain by ourselves the final causes of the world; he does not ascribe any action to matter and thinks it to be only an occasion for the exertion of divine activity; he thinks the body to be the prison of the soul, which thus cannot directly perceive the outside world, but only the impressions made on the senses from without. But notwithstanding these novelties introduced by him into Christian philosophy,

the idealists have no reason at all to be pleased with his theories; for he not only admitted the existence of a personal God distinct from the world, but also highly esteemed supernatural faith, of which he would not allow the least doubt. His merits, then, as far as idealism is concerned, consist only in having pointed out self as the starting-point of solid, unprejudiced philosophy, and in having first raised the standard of opposition against the scholastics.<sup>1</sup>

Further steps had therefore to be made in the direction of subjective tendency and were made indeed by Immanuel Kant (born at Königsberg, in 1724, died there in 1804). Dissatisfied with Berkley's skepticism as well as Leibnitz's dogmatism, based on Des Cartes' system, he endeavored to arrive at truth by a middle way. He would neither say with Berkley that objects without us had no reality at all and were merely fictions of our mind, nor admit with Leibnitz and the ancients<sup>2</sup> that our reasoning was conformable to objects as they are in themselves. To evidence truth lying between skepticism and dogmatism, he built up a philosophical system consisting in the criticism of our cognoscitive powers. The criticism of the senses, by which we form perceptions, he called transcendental æsthetics; the criticism of understanding, by which we form judgments and notions, transcendental analytics; the criticism of reason, by which we draw conclusions and form ideas, transcendental dialectics or metaphysics. As reason regards theoretical and practical truths, metaphysics is subdivided into the criticism of the pure, and into that of the practical reason. All these criticisms he published successively in several works; his system, however, is laid down chiefly in the *Criticism of Pure Reason*, published at Riga in 1781 and 1787.

Kant grants that there is an object outside us or a thing in itself, which by acting on us furnishes the matter of our perceptions. But the senses can perceive the object only by certain forms innate in their very nature; they, consequently, give the form of our perceptions. This, therefore, originates within us and results by no means from outside things, though it appears to be in them and to make an impression on us; just as to those who look through green spectacles everything seems to be green. There are two forms of this kind in our senses: space, by which we perceive things one

---

<sup>1</sup> Des Cartes expounds his system chiefly in the following works: *Meditationes de prima Philosophia*, Paris, 1641, Amstelod., 1644; *Principia Philosophiæ*, Amst., 1644. *Meditationes de Methodo*, contained in the work: *Specimina philosophica*, Lugdun. Bat., 1644.

<sup>2</sup> Kant and the idealists were not acquainted with scholastic philosophy itself; they knew Leibnitz and Wolf, and the scholastics only as far as contained in them. For this reason they charged them all indifferently with dogmatism.

with the other, and time, by which we perceive them one after the other. Space and time, therefore, have no reality in the things themselves, but are merely the framework of our senses, projected on the objects perceived and reflected from them. What the object is outside us in itself, we cannot know, since it never appears to us in its own form, but only under that of our senses. For this reason Kant styles it transcendent, that is, beyond our experience, or the unknowable *Æ*.

Our senses having formed perceptions, the understanding, to reduce them to order, begins to judge of them. Now just as the senses cannot perceive the outward object, so the understanding cannot judge of the perceptions but by certain inborn forms or modes, which, as judging rests on perceiving, are founded on space and time. Judgment has twelve modes, for its needs are determined as to quantity, quality, relation, and modality. As to quantity it is universal, particular, or singular; as to quality it is affirmative, negative, or indefinite; as to relation, it is categorical, hypothetical, or disjunctive; as to modality, it is problematical, assertory, or apodictic. These subjective forms are again projected on the object judged of, as the forms of perception are reflected from the object perceived. Thus all objects appear to us under twelve forms; under that of unity, plurality, or totality as to quantity; of reality, negation, or limitation as to quality; of substance, cause, or reciprocity as to relations; of possibility, necessity, or existence as to modality, each one resulting from a respective mode of judgment.<sup>1</sup> Being respects, under which all things are reduced to unity, they are also termed notions or categories of the understanding. Kant thinks to have thus proved that judgments in which time, space,

<sup>1</sup> The following table illustrates under what form each mode of judgment makes the object appear:

		Forms									
		Of the Judgment or Understanding.									Of the Object.
I. Quantity.	{	Universal,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Unity.
		Particular,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Plurality.
		Singular,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Totality.
II. Quality.	{	Affirmative,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Reality.
		Negative,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Negation.
		Indefinite,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Limitation.
III. Relation.	{	Categorical,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Substance.
		Hypothetical,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Cause.
		Disjunctive,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Reciprocity.
IV. Modality.	{	Problematical,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Possibility.
		Assertory,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Necessity.
		Apodictic,	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Existence.

or one of the twelve notions or notes deduced from them are predicated of a subject, must be termed "synthetical *a priori*;" synthetical, because we extend our perceptions by them; *a priori*, because the predicate or the form attributed pre-exists in our mind before all experience.<sup>1</sup>

Again, as understanding puts order in our perceptions by judging, so reason reduces our judgments to unity by conclusions; and as understanding judges by twelve innate modes, so reason draws conclusions by the three inborn forms of the categorical, the hypothetical, and the disjunctive syllogism. By them reason views things under the relation of inherence, dependence, and coherence. Inherence presupposes a last and absolute substance in which things inhere; dependence a last and absolute cause on which they depend; coherence a last and absolute whole to which they belong as parts and in which they are referred to one another. All things are comprised in these three ideas and reduced by them to unity. The absolute substance is the soul, the object of Psychology; the absolute cause is God, the object of Theology; the absolute whole is the world, the object of Cosmology. It is quite consequent that in Kant's system God, the soul, the world have no reality but in our mind, as far as they are implied in its innate forms of reasoning as the end at which they aim. Outside our mind, in themselves they are unreal. The appearance which they have is, as he plainly says, a necessary illusion, a sophism, a reflection of the framework of our mind, a product of our reason. This criticism of the theoretical reason, which, as it is independent of any outward object, he calls pure, constitutes Kant's Metaphysics or Transcendental Dialectics.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> From this definition it is evident that Kant speaks of synthetical and *a priori* judgments in a quite peculiar sense, not like other philosophers. He admits a judgment only then to be analytical, if the predicate is *formally* contained in the conception of the subject; and terms the judgment, the predicate of which is *virtually* contained in the conception of the subject, synthetical. For this reason he thinks mathematical demonstrations to be synthetical, not analytical. But generally those judgments are called synthetical, the predicate of which is not contained at all in the conception of the subject, and those analytical the predicate of which is either formally or virtually contained in the conception of the subject. Again, according to common definition that judgment is *a priori* in which the connection between subject and predicate is known from their very essence; and that *a posteriori* in which the connection between subject and predicate is known, not from their essence, but from the experience of their effects. As now Kant himself says that space, time, and the other notes mentioned are necessarily contained in the conceptions we form of things, and as moreover the form of our cognitions is, not inborn in the mind, but received from the object, as we shall prove afterwards, it is evident that there are no such synthetical judgments *a priori*.

<sup>2</sup> Transcendental Kant terms: first, any state or quality of the mind respecting the transcendent; secondly, the forms and ideas which pre-exist in the mind independent of experience; thirdly, the inquiry about the forms of the mind.

Lastly Kant criticizes the practical reason which has to put order in our actions as the theoretical reason has to reduce our thoughts to unity. Reason regulates our actions by dictating to us the moral law. In this Kant distinguishes a material and a formal principle. The material principle of the law is the good to be done or the order to be put into reality. Good is not contained in the nature of our reason, but allures our will from without and is brought into connection with it by the understanding; for this not only conceives the order which it necessarily produces itself, but, in accordance to it, also devises what our will freely realizes in nature, thus connecting the theoretical and the practical reason, and establishing analogy between nature and morality. The formal principle of the moral is the necessity which it lays on us to do good or to put order into reality by our will. It does not actuate us from without, but lies within the very nature of our will, just as the forms of judging and reasoning are inborn in our mind, and not brought into it from without. Both principles are maxims of our actions; but as good regards our self-love, it varies in each individual, and is, for this reason, changeable and particular, implying at most hypothetical necessity. The formal principle, on the contrary, being in the nature of reason itself, is common to all men, invariable, and binding absolutely. From this difference of the two principles the following formula may be deduced as the supreme moral law: "Act only on such a maxim as may also be the principle of a universal law."

Since pure necessity is the formal principle of the moral law, it is also the formal cause of morality. A moral action, then, must be determined by its necessity, and by no means by the regard to any good to be obtained. Whatsoever proceeds from this necessity is moral; whatsoever flows from another source, however so much productive of good, is not moral. The motive, therefore, of a moral action cannot be fear or love of a being distinct from us, but ought to be respect for the law inborn in our nature. From this character of the moral law Kant draws two conclusions: first, that man in regard to morality is autonomous, that is, a law unto himself, and subject to no outward lawgiver, not even to God; secondly, that, as the sensual nature revolts against the rational, to which it ought to be subordinate, the law of reason is in regard to sensual appetite a categorical command or imperative. But though our will must be actuated by the respect for the moral law as its proper motive, it, nevertheless, cannot act without the highest good as its last object; for as there cannot be an action without an object, so there is no other object for the will than good. We must infer from this that the moral law binds us to tend toward the highest good, so, however, that this is not the cause, but the effect of our actions.



Searching into the nature of the supreme good, Kant thinks it to consist in virtue and happiness ; the former being the cause of the latter, and both together accomplishing the harmony between nature and morality.

The necessity of the moral law moreover implies as presuppositions the freedom of the will, the immortality of the soul, and the existence of God. The freedom of the will Kant does not place in the power to act or not to act, to choose this or that object, but in the exemption from outward compulsion. It is clear that morality which consists in self-determination presupposes such freedom, for self-determination and compulsion are incompatible. The immortality of the soul he thinks to be a condition of morality, because this cannot be obtained but by an indefinite progress, which again prerrequires an endless existence of the soul progressing. The existence of God is presupposed to the moral order for the following reason : In this world sensual nature cannot be fully subjected to reason, nor is happiness enjoyed in proportion to virtue. But as, nevertheless, it ought to be so, there must be an intelligent cause which will once reduce nature to perfect harmony with morality and thus realize our happiness. This intelligent cause we call God. Therefore these presuppositions do not rest on any objective ground which theoretical reason may attain, either directly or by the way of conclusion, but are simply founded on the practical reason by the subjective necessity of the moral law on the one side and the utter impossibility to comply with it on the other, such conditions not being fulfilled. We have, therefore, either to assume them or to despair of morality. This being the basis on which they rest, they are simply postulates of the practical reason, admitted not by science, but by faith.

From the existence of God religion is deduced. If God by his interference puts full harmony between virtue and nature, He undoubtedly also intends and orders our happiness. The moral law, therefore, compels us to consider ourselves bound by Him to strive for happiness. Now religion is the tendency towards the highest good or happiness so far as this is enjoined on us by God. It is, consequently, not the source, but the consequence of morality, not a manifestation, but merely a support of the moral order ; it is like the existence of God on which it is based, not a truth attainable by science, but a presupposition forced on us and assumed by faith. Having given this definition of religion Kant tries to show that all the mysteries of Christianity are nothing but symbolical expressions and personifications of the ideas and tenets laid down in this system of morality.

It has always been agreed that the result of Kant's critical researches was merely negative. Philosophy had been reduced by

him to Dialectics; of Metaphysics all objects were denied; any knowledge of things in themselves was declared to be utterly impossible. Kant had destroyed everything and built up nothing. But what is still worse, he has fallen just into those errors which he pretended to have overcome by his criticism. He first intended to refute skepticism, and establishes it in its most outspoken form. How could we rely on our cognitions with certainty if all things outside us are absolutely unknowable, and if any determinate form of an object appearing is a mere illusion? What, moreover, has become of the objective order itself according to his views? True, he admits a thing in itself, but he deprives it of possibility as well as necessity, of plurality and unity, of reality and negation, of cause and substance, of time, space, and existence; since all that is not real in the object, but an appearance produced by our mind. What then is still left of the thing in itself? Certainty has vanished away from his system; because there is neither an object outside us, which we may know, nor a power within us by which we may know it. He also tried to overcome dogmatism, but nobody has ever relied on faith so blindly as he. The truths he saved he admitted as postulates on no objective ground or scientific demonstration, but on account of a mere subjective want of the mind, the faculties of which were already undermined by his criticism of pure reason. Notwithstanding these lacks Kant's theories are the real foundation of idealism. Having broken up all connection with antiquity, he constructed a quite new system of philosophy, the seeming solidity and consistency of which roused the minds of his age to enthusiasm for modern speculation. By him first reason was declared to be absolute, being as to the form of its cognition independent of any outward object, and producing by itself the physical as well as the moral order of the world. Nobody will deny that therein lies the germ of idealism. This he even formally developed, when, endeavoring to accomplish the unity of his system, he guessed that all objects, the mind as well as the outward world opposed to it, since they belong to the same whole of experience, might be two-fold phenomena or products of one and the selfsame thing in itself.

John Gottlieb Fichte (born at Romenau in Lusatia in 1762, died in Berlin in 1814) took up and unfolded this idea. He, then, admitted only one thing existing, which had both a subjective and an objective appearance, that is, which developed itself both in thought and in nature. Accordingly he attributed the same entity to the real and the ideal, to the subject thinking and the object thought of. By this identity of thinking and being he imagined he had overcome skepticism, since nature was thus no longer a mere illusion as in Berkeley's and Kant's system, but had reality, though

none distinct from ourselves ; and had thus reached, not dogmatism or blind faith, but true science, which derived all things from their last source and reduced them again to absolute unity.

But by what reason does Fichte uphold the identity of the real and the ideal, and how does he base his system on this main idea ? The connection between subject and predicate, says he, when asserted by us in a sentence absolutely true, is not only taken in, but also put into reality, by the mind judging ; for if it were outside us and taken up from there, its affirmation would not be absolutely, but hypothetically true, because dependent on an outward condition. But the real connection between subject and predicate also implies the reality of the subject and predicate connected ; therefore, if a sentence is absolutely true, also its subject and predicate are taken in and put into reality by the mind. The subject and predicate, then, of any absolutely true sentence are the mind itself, which is both that of which something is thought or said, and that which is thought or said. All judgments of our mind may thus be reduced to the general and abstract formula : " I am I," or " the ego puts itself into reality." This absolutely and undeniably true principle, however, lying at the bottom of all judgments, must be conceived to be quite void of any determinate contents and to involve nothing but mere activity, by which pure and indeterminate being puts itself into reality. We arrive thus not only at the identity of thinking and being, of subject and object, but also at an absolute ego underlying our judgments ; because the latter are nothing else but an act by which the ego affirms or realizes itself.

But the absolute ego never appears in its abstractedness or indetermination ; since it always strives to determine itself or, as thinking and being are the same, to get conscious of itself as of a determinate being. To this tendency the ego, for an unaccountable reason, meets with a hindrance within itself ; for as it can never determine itself fully, and never succeeds in thinking itself as the being containing all, but only as a being having some reality, we must suppose a hindrance in it, limiting or restricting its activity. Now this hindrance, as it is opposed to the ego and sets a limit or a negation of its entity, is to be considered as the non-ego. From this Fichte's second principle follows : " The non-ego is not the ego," or " the ego sets the non-ego in opposition to itself." Not only the hindrance, however, but also the determination effected by its limitation must be considered as a non-ego. Between the ego and the non-ego, that is, the hindrance, there is a mutual action and reaction. The hindrance acts on the ego and thus determines it : conversely the ego acts on the non-ego ; because it continually strives to overcome the hindrance and to get conscious of its full entity. Thus Fichte arrives at his third fundamental principle : " The ego

sets a limited non-ego in opposition to the limited ego," which may be resolved into two others: "The ego limits or determines itself by the non-ego," and "the ego limits or determines the non-ego by itself." Any determinate object, therefore, which we perceive is a determination produced both in the ego by the non-ego and in the non-ego by the ego. Several definitions and conceptions are based thereon. Inasmuch as the ego is determined, it is passive, and the non-ego, on the contrary, active; but inasmuch as the ego determines the non-ego, it is active, and the non-ego passive. Inasmuch as the ego is passive, it is endowed with intellect; and inasmuch as it is active, it is endowed with will. As far as the ego is always limited by the non-ego, it is finite, and the non-ego infinite; but again as far as the ego has the tendency always to overcome the non-ego, its power, though not its act, is infinite, and the non-ego finite.

The absolute ego Fichte calls God. But God does not get conscious immediately by himself or as far as he is in the state of indetermination, but through infinitely many individual and determinate egos, contained in him as organs of consciousness. Of these each one is finite; only their evergrowing multitude is infinite. The collection of all the individual egos is mankind; whilst the hindrance is the material world. Mankind alone has entity or reality: matter is unreal; because it is nothing but a limit or negation to be destroyed by consciousness in an endless struggle.

Philosophy is the consciousness which the individual ego has of its being determined by the non-ego, and of its determining the non-ego, in order fully to realize itself. The consciousness of its being determined by the non-ego is theoretical, the consciousness of its determining the non-ego is practical philosophy.

The development of his system as just expounded, Fichte attained only in his last stage. In his work, *Doctrine of Science (Grundlage der Gesamten Wissenschaftslehre)*, published in Leipsic, in 1794, he had still followed Kant in many respects, and ended by a mere subjective idealism, which resulted in negation, just as much as did the *Criticism of Pure Reason*. Denying the reality of the material world, he left entity to the thoughts of mankind alone, which, in his views, was a multitude of unconnected egos, each of them being absolute and independent. In this stage of idealism he did not term God the absolute ego comprising each individual consciousness, but the moral order of the world, that is, the complete destruction of matter, always attempted but never attained by the ego. Like Kant he also thought that God could not be reached by science or demonstration, but only by faith as a postulate of the practical reason. Being, therefore, accused of atheism and most severely criticized by Schelling, he conformed

to the views of the latter. In a new work on the blissful life in God (*Anweisung zum Gottseligen Leben*, Berlin, 1806) he said, that Deity is the absolute ego, manifesting itself in the consciousness of mankind. He had thus made a great step toward unity, but could not yet escape Schelling's blame. The latter objected against Fichte: first, that he admitted two worlds, one within, the other outside God, and, consequently, still supported dualism; secondly, that he said God so appeared in man alone and was visible, not as He is in Himself, but as He is in mankind; thirdly, that he defined matter to be unreal, and, nevertheless, required it as an active principle for the determination of the absolute ego. All these objections were evidently well grounded, and disclosed real defects in Fichte's theories.

Frederic William Schelling (born at Leonburg near Stuttgart, in 1775, died at Ragatz, in Switzerland, in 1854) had long before worked at a more consistent system of idealism. Its basis is also the identity of being and thinking; but this he so construed as not to deny the reality of nature like Fichte. At that end he endeavored to arrive by three different ways, starting each time from the conception of the absolute. These attempts, as they followed one another successively, we must distinguish as three different stages of his speculation.

First he conceived the absolute to be the identity of subject and object, or of the ideal and real as far as it contains them both, not divided, but reduced to indifference. This conception of the absolute, says he, is forced on us by the fact that being must be indifferently predicated, both of the real and the ideal order. We have, however, to consider the absolute in a twofold state: first, as the ground of being, in which subject and object are not yet distinguished, and secondly as being itself, in which subject and object are distinguished or set in opposition to each other and again reduced to indifference. The former is the undeveloped seed of entity (essence), the latter is entirely developed from it (absolute reason). The form, then, of developed entity consists essentially in the division of the essence into subject and object; neither one nor the other alone, but only both together constituting being. The object results from the tendency of the essence to bring itself forth into form, the subject from the tendency of the same to withdraw to itself the form brought forth. By bringing forth itself into form, the essence is transferred from the subjective into the objective; by withdrawing the form, it returns from the objective to the subjective order. The subject, as it determines or limits the object, implies a negative, the object, as it is determined or limited, a positive tendency. They are, consequently, opposed to each other, but do not remain in opposition, because by their very combination,

they tend towards indifference again. For this reason each single form of being bears the resemblance of the absolute, which is always, both in its essence and in its development, the identity of subject and object. Now as the division into subject and object and the reunion of them is a cognition, we may also say that cognition is the form of the developed being ; on which account Schelling had called the absolute in its full development absolute reason. The absolute is all ; since being is absolutely predicated of all things ; without it there is nothing ; whatsoever, therefore, has entity or existence, is contained in it, and is thus unchangeable, eternal, and infinite. Cognition, too, since it is nothing but the form of developed entity, cannot be without the absolute being. Hence as the formula " $A = A$ " is the supreme principle of being, so the sentence "I am I" is the supreme principle of all true cognition, both expressing absolute identity.

The absolute essence develops itself by an inward necessity and from eternity in infinitely many forms, which all are cognitions, that is, combinations of subject and object (subject-objects). These forms are divided into two series, opposite to each other, like positive and negative poles ; because they are so compounded of subject and object that in some the subject, in others the object is predominant. The difference between the subject and the object, making one predominant over the other, constitutes the finiteness of the single beings, as their indifference founds infinity. But though in each of the forms there is a difference between subject and object, nevertheless, as the series of those in which the subject is predominant counterpoises the opposite series of those in which the object prevails, the whole of them is again reduced to indifference. Thus it is clear that the totality of all the forms is the absolute being developed from its essence, and again that the absolute being is nothing else but the universe, the totality of all beings.

We must, however, still further examine the two series of development. That in which the object is predominant is called the order of the real or nature. In its lowest degree of evolution, the subject is least contained, and consequently cognition most imperfect or latent. Such is matter endowed with gravity. From this degree evolution grows by taking in more and more of the subject. The less the difference between subject and object becomes, the more cognition is apparent. So there are three succeeding stages of development: matter, light, organic life, the highest degree of which is in man. In the other series, in which the subject is predominant, and which is, therefore, called the order of the ideal, evolution goes on by imbedding in the subject more and more of the object. There are also three succeeding degrees of development in it: truth perceived by science, beauty embraced by religion,

beauty expressed by art, all which reaches its height in the ideal commonwealth. In man, as far as he is possessed with art and realizes the ideal commonwealth, the two series meet each other and return by his self-conscious reason to identity. But reason, having also several degrees of evolution, finally attains its highest perfection in the philosophy of the absolute. Consequently, though all the universe is the absolute being, because it tends to indifference by its two opposite tendencies, nevertheless chiefly man is God, since in him divinity is perfect; and among men chiefly, the philosopher is the absolute, because in him the ideality or indifference of the universe is accomplished.

Schelling in this way explains even the incarnation of the Divine Word. Before Christ, said he, man acknowledged nature to be God, which was not an error, but a lower degree of consciousness; in Christ and the Apostles, he became conscious of being God himself: thus God became man. His consciousness of Divinity arrived at by Christianity was again completed by the philosophy of the absolute, which establishes in man the entire identity of the subject and the object.<sup>1</sup>

From this first stage of his speculation, which is generally styled the Philosophy of Identity, he soon proceeded to set forth a new theory of the absolute, somewhat akin to Platonism. He now said that the absolute was, in its essence, merely ideal, and developed itself, not by differences, but by intuition. Reflecting on itself from eternity, the absolute produces its own likeness, which is its form, its reality, and its object. But this likeness, for the very reason that it resembles the absolute, has the power also to produce its idea or image, and thus to transform itself into reality. Now the first idea, having received the entity of the absolute by communication, and, consequently, possessing also its independence and freedom, can conceive itself under a twofold respect, either as proceeding from, and depending on, the absolute, or as being independent and having its own entity. If it conceives itself under the latter respect, it falls off from the absolute. But thus withdrawn from its origin, in which alone it has true entity and freedom, it loses its productive power, and is henceforth not able to create aught but

<sup>1</sup> Schelling expounds the system spoken of in the following of his works:

a. *Darstellung meines Systems der Philosophie*, published in the periodical, *Zeitschrift für Speculative Physik*, von Schelling, Jena and Leipzig, 1800-1801. Band II.

b. *Zweite mit Zusätzen bereicherte Ausgabe der Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Natur*, 1803.

c. *Fernere Darstellungen aus dem System der Philosophie*, published in the periodical, *Neue Zeitschrift für Speculative Physik*, Tübingen, 1802.

d. *Jahrbücher der Medicin*, in Gemeinschaft mit Marcus herausgegeben, Tübingen, 1806.

images of its own nothingness. Such are sensible objects, which are mere appearances, having no reality in themselves, but only relatively to the idea withdrawn from the absolute. The sensible world, therefore, is nothing but the ruins of the ideal.

An idea of this kind is the human soul, which, inasmuch as it depends on the absolute being, is infinite ; but inasmuch as it has fallen off from it, is entangled in the sensitive world, united to a body finite and individual. As far as it can either return to God from its finiteness, or abide in separation from him, it is endowed with finite liberty, the possibility to do good or evil. The destination of the soul is its detachment from self and its return to the absolute, to be attained by its retirement from the sensible and the contemplation of the ideal. If, during this life, the soul has not detached itself from matter, it shall, after death, be embodied again. Finally, however, all souls will return to God, the immaterial world will then vanish away, and the real will perfectly coalesce with the ideal. According to this theory, God is incarnate in the world from eternity, and successively falling off and returning to himself gets at last enriched with full reality.<sup>1</sup>

Yet Schelling's speculation had not reached its last stage. In his latter years he devised a system which, combining the two former, was to account scientifically for the mysteries of Christianity, and is, therefore, called "Mystic-theosophistic (theological) Philosophy."

According to these latest views of his, three moments are to be distinguished in the absolute ; first, the last ground or essence ; secondly, the division of the essence into two opposite elements, into cause and existence, or into darkness and light, or into nature and reason ; thirdly, the reunion of the elements divided. The indifferent essence is the possibility of the Divine Being, which, however, is never merely possible, but always tends to existence or determinations by being differenced within itself from all eternity. As God, the absolute being, exists by himself, he is the cause or origin of his existence. For this reason his essence necessarily gets into opposition between cause and existence, which two are also really not only logically distinct. As cause God strives to bring forth himself. But this is at first a blind and unsuccessful tendency ; he succeeds in bringing forth himself into existence only by begetting reason and forming an idea of himself, the eternal word. From this we understand that cause, nature, and darkness on one side ; existence, reason, and light on the other, are one and the

---

<sup>1</sup> This system Schelling expounds in the two following works :

a. *Philosophie und Religion*. Tübingen, 1804.

b. *Darlegung des wahren Verhältnisses der Natur-philosophie zur verbesserten Fichtischen Lehre*. Tübingen, 1806.



selfsame thing. But the different elements are to be reduced to indifference again; therefore they struggle with one another until reason entirely pervades nature and enters into union with it. The result of this union is love or the spirit. In this system Schelling ascribes the realization of the absolute, not to the intellect, but to the will, calling the tendency of blind nature the particular or egoistic, that of reason the universal will.

This process of evolution, by which God attains his perfection, is cosmogony, that is, the generation of the world. The cause or blind nature first developed from divine essence is matter; light or reason begotten of matter is the order brought into it; matter and light together form the world. First matter alone exerts its activity; but its products perish, their remnants being still found in the paleontological plants and animals; then light proceeds from matter, not at once, but by degrees, the highest of which is in man. From man arises the spirit, also by a successive elevation; because there is in human nature as everywhere in the world a prolonged struggle between the particular and the universal will. Though man having become spirit is so far the highest appearance of the absolute and even its actual existence; he is, nevertheless, not yet the absolute itself; because in this the opposite elements cannot be separated again, but in man they can. In him the particular will can oppose the universal. From this the possibility of doing good or evil results. Good is the subjection of the particular unto the universal will, or the union of them both; evil is the opposition between them, the abiding in ourselves, or the separation from God. Through this opposition between the two wills man must pass with absolute necessity, in order that the absolute may attain its last and full realization. The particular will, therefore, must tempt and draw man to sin. But at last reason (the divine word) or the universal will shall overcome the particular and enter with it into an indissoluble union. Then God will be perfect and all in all. It is not difficult to see how this speculation was intended to unfold the mysteries of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption from sin by the Word, and of man's final bliss in God, or rather to strip them of their supernatural truth and make them mere allegories and myths representing the tenets of pantheism.<sup>1</sup>

Schelling's philosophy was considered to be one of the sublimest productions of the human mind. It was, however, generally admitted that the style of his writings was rather poetical than philo-

<sup>1</sup> This system Schelling first set forth in his renowned work on the nature of human freedom (*Ueber das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit*, Landshut, 1809). He developed and completed it afterwards in his *Prelections on the Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation*, published by Trauenstädt under the title, *Vorlesungen Schellings* in Berlin, 1842.

sophical ; that his method was by no means strict and logical ; and that he had been continually changing his views and contradicting his own principles. There was on this account much complaining about the confusion and obscurity of his system. A clearer and more scientific proof of Idealism was still looked for.

This was attempted by George William Hegel (born in Stuttgart in 1770, died in Berlin in 1831). The following is an outline of his system :

The universal alone has entity and reality ; the individual or particular is but a transient opposition, consequently unreal and nothing in itself. Now as the universal determines and realizes itself by contrasts without losing its identity, and as such an immanent activity is dialectical or intellectual, it must be the same as thought. The universal, therefore, does not result from thought ; for it exists by itself and only becomes self-conscious in our mind ; nor is thought the affection of a subject, for it is being itself. If we moreover examine what kind of thought the universal may be, we find it to be contained in conception. The latter, consequently, is the substance underlying all phenomena, the essence of all things, the reality of all that exists.

As to the development or the determination, which being takes by differences or contrasts, Hegel generally follows Schelling. We must distinguish in each development three moments. In the first the universal or thought is still indeterminate and indifferent ; in the second it turns itself into its opposite, that is into the particular or individual by denying its own universality ; in the third it denies the negation of its universality, and thus withdraws and unites its opposite with itself. By a succession of such divisions and reunions being grows in reality, and gets at last enriched with all determinations. The first moment is also called the thesis, the second the antithesis, the third the synthesis. Now as the universal is identical with conception, they both have just the same evolution. But conception evolves itself in three great periods. It is first pure or logical thought ; then it turns itself into its opposite, that is, into the individual or nature ; and finally, it returns to itself by denying and withdrawing nature, and thus becomes self-conscious or spirit. In the first of these periods it is by itself, in the second out of itself, in the third in itself.

The stages and degrees into which each of these periods is subdivided, have to be particularly considered.<sup>1</sup> Pure thought, in its first stage, is indeterminate being, which is the same as becoming, because it is all and nothing. It is all, because it is universal and

---

<sup>1</sup> Each degree of the first period is a dialectical form, which, as thinking and being are the same, is identical with an ontological category. The whole first period forms logic and ontology.

predicated of everything ; it is nothing, because it is no particular being. But being all and being nothing, or rather being and not being make up becoming, which implies the idea of something that is and is not. Such a character, being evinces in its endless evolution, on account of which it is in continual motion, always vanishing away and arising again. Indeterminate being itself has to undergo a threefold evolution by the way of division and reunion ; for it is quality, quantity, and measure ; quantity being the outward determination of quality, and measure the union of them both. This evolution being finished, pure thought arises at its second stage, that is, it becomes essence, which is the apparition of being to itself. The essence again is first the ground of existence, then it passes over into appearance, finally it withdraws the appearance to itself and becomes actuality, which is the ground supporting the appearance. From this thought grows to conception, the union of being and essence, the third stage of the first period. Conception, too, has three degrees of evolution. In the first it is subjective, and as such it is first indeterminate and general (conception as such), then it is divided into subject and predicate (judgment), at last reunited (conclusion). In the second degree of evolution it is objective, that is, it becomes object, not yet an individual, but an abstract and universal one. This object first consists of beings considered in themselves and not yet connected, then of beings connected inwardly, at last of the result of their connection. In the third degree of evolution the conception withdraws the object to itself and thus becomes idea, which again is first life, then cognition, at last absolute idea, the union of life and cognition. In the absolute idea the conception as being by itself has attained its highest perfection, and is ripe for going out of itself by becoming an individual object. So it enters upon its second period of evolution. The idea then becomes nature, its own outside and contrast. Nature, too, has to go through three stages of development answering those of thought. As being, thought turns itself into matter connected only mechanically or outwardly ; as essence, into matter connected inwardly by action and reaction ; as idea, into organic life existing in the earth, the plants, the animals.<sup>1</sup> From the animal life the human spirit is developed, who first sets in opposition and then unites the individual object to thought. Thus we have come to the last period of evolution, in which thought is in itself, and the synthesis of idea and nature is accomplished. This period, too, comprises three stages.

The spirit in its first stage is subjective ; and in the first degree of this stage the soul of nature, being immortal, feeling, and actual ;

---

<sup>1</sup> To each degree of evolution in the second period answers a branch of natural philosophy, which again, as thinking and being are identical, coincides as to reality with nature itself.

in the second degree ego or consciousness, being first conscious, then self-conscious, at last reason; in the third degree spirit, the union of soul and consciousness, being intellect, will, and freedom. The spirit is intellect, inasmuch as it gives its own form to the object; will, inasmuch as it is conscious of having done so; freedom, inasmuch as the intellect and the will are united. In the second stage the spirit becomes objective by bringing forth the world of freedom: right (regarding property, contracts, and punishment of injury); honesty (concerning voluntariness and guilt, intention and well-being, good and evil); morally (in the family, society, and the State). In the third stage the spirit, withdrawing the world of freedom to itself, becomes absolute. As such it is the absolute and complete union of subject and object, of idea and nature by the consciousness of being both one and the other. Even to this height of perfection the spirit arrives by degrees, for it knows itself to be all or the identity of the subjective and objective order, first by art, then by religion, finally by philosophy. By art it knows itself to be all beauty (reality under sensitive forms), by religion all spirit, by philosophy both beauty and spirit. Philosophy, too, has many evolutions and is fully perfected by Hegel, for he aroused mankind to perfect consciousness.<sup>1</sup>

The ideas of morality and religion, as contained in this system, need some further explanation. Religion is only a moment of philosophy. Philosophy is the science of the divine evolutions or the consciousness of reason, by which she knows herself to be all. Religion, too, is self-consciousness and knowledge of God. The difference between one and the other lies in the way and in the degree in which they make the absolute identity of all known or raise the absolute spirit to consciousness. Religion exhibits the absolute identity to our feeling by symbols and myths, philosophy to our intellect by ideas; religion arouses the spirit to the consciousness of being all spirit, philosophy to that of being both spirit and nature. Religion has a double aspect; it is both in God and in man. In man it is the knowledge he has of God, in God it is the self-consciousness he attains in man. It is, nevertheless, one and the selfsame act; for as God gets self-conscious only in man, man's knowledge of God is nothing but the consciousness of his being in God. The degrees by which such consciousness is attained are the different religions successively existing in the world.

The main idea of all religions is the reconciliation of the finite with the infinite; for as religion is God's self-consciousness attained

---

<sup>1</sup> To the evolutions of the third period belong: anthropology, phenomenology, pneumatology, ethics, jurisprudence, politics, theology, philosophy.

Hegel's system is, at length, expounded in his *Encyclopædia of the Philosophical Sciences* (*Encyclopædie der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, Heidelberg, 1817).

in man, by it the finite is lifted up and united to the infinite. This reconciliation attempted by all forms of religions was not accomplished but by Christianity. By this, God has become fully self-conscious in man. The dogmas of Christianity, therefore, must express the evolutions of the conception. They, consequently, disclose the Divine life in its three great periods, or the conception as it is by itself, out of itself, and in itself. The first of these periods may be called the reign of the Father, the second the reign of the Son, the third the reign of the Spirit. The first period is the life of God before the generation of the world, and consists chiefly in his evolution into Trinity. Inasmuch as God is by himself, He is the Father; inasmuch as He is out of himself, He is the Son; inasmuch as He is in himself, He is the Spirit. Only note that the Son is not nature, but the conception itself inasmuch as it turns itself into nature. The second period of the Divine life comprises man's fall into sin and redemption by Christ. Nature, as first put forth by the conception, was still indeterminate, containing matter and reason indifferently. But it was necessary that it should be divided in man, and that reason should come into opposition with matter. This division, however, being opposition between the universal and the particular, was of evil, not because such a conflict ought not to be, but because it has to be overcome by reunion. Therefore, as the conception also, as far as it is out of itself, must for the sake of evolution be continually divided and reunited, it is quite necessary that man fall into sin; and even that sin be involved in his very nature. From sin we are redeemed by the reconciliation of the finite and the infinite in our own persons. But this presupposes in our minds the certain knowledge that the opposition between the particular and the universal, the finite and the infinite, is as such unreal, and has been overcome. Now in Christ, this reunion is symbolically exhibited; He is for this reason called God-Man. His death is the symbol of God's denying his own infinity and becoming finite nature; his resurrection from the dead the symbol of his denying the finiteness of nature and restoring his infinity. The reconciliation of the finite and the infinite as such being exhibited in Christ, each individual man can become conscious that it is realized also in his own person. The reunion of the conflicting elements being accomplished, the third period, the reign of the Spirit, begins. From the reconciliation of the particular and the universal God arises as the spirit of the community; for as the latter so consists of many members that their unity is real and their plurality only apparent, in it God becomes conscious of his being all Spirit. The testimony which he thus gives, or the consciousness which he thus attains of himself, is called faith. The object of the latter, therefore, is the accomplishment of the reconciliation between the

finite and the infinite, between nature and God. From these premises Hegel deduces the justification of man by faith alone, and the other dogmas of old Lutheranism, which he in this way reduced to a scientific form and inserted in his pantheistic system.

Religion is not the foundation of morality, but rather succeeds it as a higher degree of evolution. We have already seen that honesty in its highest development regards good and evil. Good is the union of the particular and universal, or the subjection of the former unto the latter. Evil, on the contrary, is the prevailing of the finite over the infinite, or the opposition of the particular to the universal. As far as ever good is realized in social life, in which the individual is indeed subject to the whole, and the particular beings coalesce in one universal being, honesty becomes morality. Society, then, is morality itself; and the more society is extended and united, the higher a degree of morality it is. Social life is most perfect in the state which is not distinguished from, or subject to the Church, but rather replaces, and contains it as one of its moments. To live, therefore, in the state, according to its laws, is consummate virtue. Yea, since the state is the supreme evolution of the objective spirit, it is God himself present and actual in the world, or the Divine will putting itself into act and organization. Among the several states again one usually prevails. This Hegel calls the world-spirit, and maintains that, as long as it upholds its pre-eminency, the others are in regard to it without rights.

As Hegel in a general way completed the systems of Fichte and Schelling, so he brought also the ideas of religion and morality, as consistent with idealism, to their last development. Between him and Schelling there is scarcely any considerable difference in this regard. Schelling also places moral evil in the opposition of the particular to the universal, and moral good and happiness in the union of them both; in his system also the State is over the Church, and philosophy over religion. Fichte in his later period, when he began to yield to Schelling, admitted morality to consist in the union of the finite with the absolute; but in his former period, when yet a follower of Kant, he thought it to lie in the destruction of the non-ego, from which the infinity of the ego would result. Man, then, would be the more moral, the more he succeeded in overcoming the limit. The complete destruction of the non-ego, which, however, will never be accomplished, Fichte calls the moral order, and this again, as it is the infinity of the ego, he thinks to be God. It is evident from this that morality and divinity result merely from the human will. God, conceived as a being distinct from the world, and existing by and in itself, Fichte thought, would imply inextricable contradictions and be nothing but a fiction of

our intellect. Morality and religion are thus one and the self-same thing in his view.

Hegel's system was considered by his followers to be the highest evolution of philosophy. To find fault with it was the height of ignorance. It was to be received as complete and absolute wisdom, at least on account of the authority of its sublime inventor, until a higher and immediate insight into it would be obtained by assiduous study. Nobody has indeed brought forth another development of idealism after Hegel. Nevertheless, after having been highly admired for some time, especially in Berlin, he began to be severely attacked, most of all by Arthur Schopenhauer. Soon his own school went asunder into two opposite parties. One stuck to Hegel's tenets just as they were set forth by him; the other drew the consequences contained in them. This latter party prevailed over the former. Idealism, then, in its strict sense was given up and Atheism, Materialism, and Nihilism was successively embraced. The Atheists, who started from idealism, were headed by Lewis Feuerbach, the Materialists by Charles Vogt, the Nihilists by Edward von Hartmann, the author of *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, published from 1868 to 1875 in seven editions. It cannot be denied that idealism gave rise to all these systems, however much it seems to be opposed to them. If God has no reality distinct from the world, or rather if the reality of the world is God himself in his evolutions, it is consequent that there is no personal God. Again, if being and thinking are the same, the Materialists have as much right to begin with matter and to bury thought in it, as the Idealists had to start from thought and to lift up matter to its sphere. Finally, a system which makes being consist of a combination of contradictions, was not without reason turned into Nihilism. It should, however, be remarked, that in our days modern speculation is generally based on Kant, because its tenets are more simply and easily explained by inborn forms and illusions of the mind, than by the abstruse theories of ideal evolution.

Now is it not useless to criticize the systems just expounded, the absurdity of which is so evident to common-sense? We must not forget that they are of the highest importance in modern history, and that our century did not view them in this light. First Idealism spread nearly over the whole civilized world. It originated in Germany, and was not only hailed by Protestants, but also admired by some Catholics. From Germany it was imported into France, and of late also into Italy; it found its way to England and even to America. Then both in science and in practical life it has brought forth highly important effects. There is in this century scarcely any error in Theology or Philosophy, within and without the Church, which has not sprung from these systems commenced

by Des Cartes and completed by Hegel. That Atheism, Materialism, and Nihilism are their genuine offspring, we have just shown. And is it not also a revival of Kant's inborn forms of thinking and reasoning, when modern textbooks and professors of philosophy, at the very outset of their courses, lay it down as an axiom that nothing exists but what we perceive by our senses; that God and the spirituality of the human soul are mere illusions, and that, therefore, metaphysics has no other object than the acts of our mind, and must be replaced by dialectics? But even where the principles of these systems were not admitted, they did not fail to produce harmful effects. They first discredited scholastic philosophy in public opinion, and caused it to be gradually removed from Catholic schools. Then they brought disgrace on philosophy in general and on human reason itself; because the monstrous errors of the modern, and the failure of the ancient philosophers seemed to evidence the incapacity of reason to attain truth. In France this gave rise to Traditionalism, in Germany and other countries to the neglect of philosophical studies. Even the political errors of our time are based on idealism. Revolution is justified by its first moral principle that human reason is absolute, autonomous, and ought not to receive a law from without. But also the absolutism of monarchs and of the stronger political parties is prompted by the theory that the individual ought to be swallowed up by the universal. Above all the tyranny practiced by the political power over consciences and religious associations is not to be blamed, if Church and religion are only inferior evolutions of the absolute to be transformed into the State or philosophy. There is, on this account, no doubt that, though Idealism as a philosophical system is out of date at present, nevertheless many of its principles and its baneful consequences still exist, and poison both the public life and the science of our days. All this considered, I think it will not be without interest to search into the very foundations of these systems, and to inquire whether they are really reduced to that unity which should be looked upon as a proof of their truth, and avert cultivated minds from the study of Ancient Philosophy.

---



## DE LA SALLE: HIS LIFE AND WORK.

THE American tourist who enters Rheims for the first time is generally disappointed. He knows it is a very old city, and one that has played many a bright part in history. He has perhaps fresh in mind a few scraps of the Gallic War, and has probably been musing for some time back on the long procession of kings that came up to the Cathedral Church to receive their crowns from the successors of St. Rémi. His classical reminiscences and historical readings have doubtless forced him to the conclusion that the Rheims which was built before the Franks crossed the Rhine, which witnessed the baptism of Clovis, and the triumphant entry of the Maid of Orleans, must needs be a quaint-looking, old-fashioned town. And indeed his expectations are not altogether vain; for he soon meets with a gate that reminds him of the Roman occupation, and descries a lofty pile that tells of pre-mediæval times. An hour's ramble, however, through the long, broad, and well-paved streets suffices to break the spell, and to show that the veil of antiquity has long since been torn away. The Rheims of the Merovingian kings, those hale monarchs *à la longue chevelure*, has been mercilessly modernized.

In straying through this seat of active industry our tourist, whose keen eye has been trained to minute inspection, soon finds himself before a spacious and antique-looking building. It evidently saw palmier days. It bears a commemorative tablet, which soon becomes an object of close scrutiny. And well it may; for in that house—once a noble mansion—was born a man of note, a philanthropist of the purest type, a public benefactor, Jean Baptiste de la Salle.

The De la Salles held a goodly rank among the nobility of Champagne. For years they had figured with distinction on the bench, and worn the highest civic honors. Their *hotel* was noted for its *bon ton*, and was a favorite resort for men of letters, men of the gown, and the fashionable society of the place. The spirit of chivalry and adventure was not alien to the family. It shone out brilliantly in Marquette, one of the pioneers of American exploration, and in three brave young fellows who fought by the side of our raw provincials in the War of Independence.

But the charming evening parties of the *Hotel de la Croix d'Or* did less to perpetuate and popularize the name of De la Salle than the less brilliant but more enduring achievements of the great educator, whose life and work we shall now endeavor to sketch.

Jean Baptiste de la Salle was born on the last day of April, 1651. His fond mother emulated the saintly Blanche of Castile in her

solicitude for her son. She strove to mould his dispositions to gentleness and piety, and every night besought Heaven to bless her endeavors. When only eight years old the boy was entered at the University School of Rheims, where he soon gave signs of real talent. Time showed that his was not the precocity that flashes out meteorlike only to be prematurely quenched in mediocrity. He never acquired the unenviable distinction of a little prodigy. He was always a hard and steady worker, trusting more to application than to his versatile endowments.

His academical success was especially gratifying to his father, who was not slow in forming high hopes and ambitious projects. He was easily convinced that his son would make his mark at the bar, and that he would ultimately win a distinguished place in the magistracy. But Heaven ruled it otherwise, and the boy was as docile to its call as the young Samuel of old. It was soon noticed that the promising student did not relish the warmly-colored schemes of his father. He aspired to something higher than family aggrandizement and civic honors; and, every evening as he knelt before his little altar, he recommended his cause to the Queen of Heaven. We can readily conceive the mute disappointment and the vexation of M. de la Salle on learning that his eldest son seriously thought of embracing the ecclesiastical state. But the future Levite was as constant in his resolve as he was amiable in urging it. His gentleness and perseverance finally overcame all obstacles, and M. de la Salle, fearing to cross the ways of Providence, gave in his acquiescence.

At nineteen, De la Salle had completed his course of philosophy and taken his M.A. degree. Without loss of time, he proceeded to Paris to study theology in the most famous schools of the kingdom. He chose the Seminary of St. Sulpice for his residence, in the hopes of finding in its strict discipline a safeguard against the distractions of a frivolous Capital. He clearly saw that study, to be thorough, must be done quietly and sequentially. For this purpose, he treated himself with Spartan severity, cutting off even legitimate pleasures, and eliminating every cause of disturbance and distraction. Like Gregory and Basil at Athens, he knew little else of the gay and noisy world outside than the dingy streets which led up to the theological schools, the famous Sorbonne. Nothing could be more in harmony with his task than this studious seclusion. It formed a golden period; but unfortunately, like all temporal enjoyments, it proved very evanescent. The young theological student had scarcely accustomed himself to his new mode of life before he was abruptly summoned home by an event which never fails to overwhelm a loving heart with grief. In July, 1671, he lost his beloved mother; and in the following April he received

the dying bequests of his father. The twofold blow was severe. Adversity is pre-eminently the school in which firm and energetic characters are moulded and tempered. After passing through it, one is able to bear without breaking the strain of honors and success, as well as the stress of disappointment and humiliation.

The young De la Salle keenly felt the bereavement, and at once realized the responsibilities of his new position. For a moment his vocation seemed to quiver in the balance. The dilemma was certainly trying. He had just turned twenty-one, and found himself head of the family, a noble family too; he had to direct the education of his brothers and sisters as well as to superintend the administration of a rich patrimony. Many would have found in such duties a plausible pretext for relinquishing all further aspirations to the priesthood; but not so with De la Salle. His vocation was not a whim, it was not the outgrowth of an impulse. It was a call from Heaven, a grace. He would not trifle with so sacred a thing. It is true he did not well see his way out of present embarrassments; but he trusted in Providence, and set to ordering his household affairs. He drew up a regulation for the juvenile community of which he was the acknowledged head, and insisted on its faithful observance. The youthful legislator instinctively recognized that "Order is Heaven's first law," and he was thoroughly convinced that a mild but steady discipline is by far the best kindness for children, just as method is the best economizer of time and the surest passport to success.

His new occupations did not, however, divert his attention from his favorite studies. He regularly devoted his leisure hours to reading works on divinity. He had a praiseworthy ambition for theological honors, and hoped one day to win the doctor's cap. The chapter of the Cathedral Church of his native city had for ages been renowned for the learning of its Canons. Several had worn the tiara, and many more attained the highest ecclesiastical dignities in the kingdom. It had even grown into a custom that at least three-fourths of its members should be Doctors in Divinity. The young De la Salle, whose recognized merit had gained him admittance into this distinguished body at the early age of sixteen, daily endeavored to make up by his culture, refinement, and amiability for the peculiar grace and dignity which years alone can give. At twenty-seven he went in for his licentiate in theology, and obtained it. At thirty he brilliantly defended his thesis before the faculty of the Rheims University, and was admitted to the Doctor's degree. In the meantime the clouds that darkened the horizon had broken, and his path was lit up once more with a cheerful beam. He had advised with experienced directors, and succeeded in putting his family affairs into good working order.

without necessitating much personal superintendence. Freed in great measure from the absorbing cares of an extensive administration, he centred all his thoughts on his vocation. During six years he had prepared himself by prayer and study for the crowning act of his life, and now the long-wished-for day was about to dawn. On the Easter eve of 1678 the noble candidate for Orders knelt at the Altar, and received from the hands of his Archbishop the sacerdotal unction. Next morning, at an early hour, he said Mass in a retired chapel in the great Cathedral. No fond parents, no admiring friends, no worshipping throng gathered round the Altar. Unobserved by men, but admired by angels, he offered his first Mass.

He now felt that henceforth he must devote himself to the welfare of his neighbor. No sacrifice seemed too great, no act of abnegation excessive. His first project was to exchange his Canoncy for a parish in one of the poorer quarters of the city; but his brothers and relatives appreciated neither his disinterestedness nor his apostolic motives. They thought that family prestige would be dimmed by his accepting a penurious curacy. They urged that a young Doctor of Divinity should display his erudition from a renowned pulpit, not from the Altar steps of an obscure parish. They did not fail to use their influence at the Archiepiscopal palace; and as Mgr. le Tellier knew and prized the qualities of the young abbé, little pressure was needed to induce him to retain in his chapter one of its finest ornaments. The voice of his Archbishop was, to De la Salle, an oracle; no word of remonstrance escaped his lips. He submitted with cheerfulness.

Foiled in one direction his zeal sought an outlet in another. This time it was the educational condition of the humbler classes that attracted his attention. The monastic schools had been swept away by the revolutionary flood of the sixteenth century, and such was the generosity of the Reformers, and the widespread influence of their downhill Reformation, that no adequate substitute was offered in their stead. The "reformers" were indeed expert at levelling institutions. They freed the people from the yoke of instruction, and gave them in exchange the husks of ignorance and the seeds of anarchy. "In the Dark Ages," said Canon Farrar the other day at an educational meeting in London, "the chasm between primary and secondary, and between the latter and university education, was not so great as now. It was possible for a boy, no matter how poor his father might be, by being diligent and receiving the education which was *freely* offered him in the *monastic schools* to rise to the very highest positions.<sup>1</sup> That was possible in

<sup>1</sup> "Poverty, in the Dark Ages, was recognized not as the accident of a student's life, but as one of its most honorable features, and it was reckoned as something monstrous and disgraceful for a man to sell his learning for gold."—*Christian Schools and Scholars*.

consequence of the recognition, by the Church in those times, of the principle that knowledge is far better than force, and virtue a more valuable possession than wealth or rank." So said the eloquent canon of St. Paul's, and so think all who are well read on the subject. But flippant writers of our own times, and notably some of our "scientists," ignore these and a hundred kindred facts. They fancy that because they have spent many of their best years in theorizing about solar physics and stellar chemistry, or perchance writing manuals of physiology, they may dogmatize with equal assurance about history, philosophy, and religion. No wonder then that they make a hopeless medley of the whole; that for reason, they substitute passion, and for argument a flood of vituperative nonsense. One Loyola, one De la Salle is more than a refutation of their furious diatribes. These men prized instruction and loved education quite as much as our high-talking professors. Men of sterling merit and far-reaching ken, they did not write themselves tired or talk themselves hoarse on the ignorance and degenerate state of the people. They did better. They resolutely set to work to educate youth, and thereby elevate and, in time, improve the social condition of the masses. Admirers have erected statues to Howard and Peabody; grateful posterity would honor itself by raising noble monuments to Loyola and De la Salle.

It is with the latter that we are now more particularly concerned. De la Salle was no furious writer nor idle declaimer. He was pre-eminently a man of action. He preferred a grain of practice to a pound of theory. After drawing up his plan and assuring himself of its practicability, he surrounded himself with a few generous volunteers, explained to them his programme, and opened a school. The Order of the Brothers of the Christian Schools was virtually founded. This was in June, 1681. Succeeding months added to the number of young men who gathered round the noble schoolmaster. Their success attracted attention, and the local authorities in many places became anxious to secure their services. Notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of his relatives, De la Salle introduced his first disciples into his own wealthy mansion. They shared his table, listened to his counsels, and discussed with him the most eligible means of prospering and perpetuating their undertaking. He early apprehended that in order to insure the stability of his followers, he should assimilate himself to their condition. To do this implied the renunciation of his canoncy and even the distribution of his patrimony. "Renounce all your possessions," said an austere adviser to him, "give up your canonical dignity, forego all idea of promotion in the Church, sacrifice the pleasures of wealth, become voluntarily poor. Your example will

have greater effect upon your disciples than the most eloquent and pathetic discourses." Once convinced of the advantages of the step, he was not dismayed at its magnitude; he did not hesitate. The sacrifice was great, but not too great for his expansive and capacious heart.

His worldly-minded friends, however, stole a march on him. They apprised Mgr. le Tellier of his extravagant intentions, and besought him to interpose his authority anew. The illustrious archbishop for a moment played into their hands; but on mature examination withdrew his veto, and allowed the young abbé to consummate his heroic sacrifice. As soon as his successor was installed in the chapter, he assembled his followers and sang a *Te Deum* for the happy issue of an event which he believed would largely contribute to the consolidation of the new institute. A little later, De la Salle and twelve of his earliest disciples knelt at the foot of the altar, and, assuming the name of Brothers of the Christian Schools, bound themselves to their new and arduous calling by the vows of religion. The seed was now fairly sown. It required but time to germinate, to blossom, and bear abundant fruit.

The cradle of the new institute was not, however, rocked in idyllic calmness. The storm muttered around it, and at last the tempest roared.

The "writing-masters" of Paris became alarmed at the spread of the new teaching Order. They formed a strong coalition, and resolved to put it down by main force. They were so indignant at the violation of their supposed rights that they summarily proceeded to eject both boys and masters from their schools. But De la Salle appeared in the law courts against their overbearing guild, pleaded his case with eloquence, and shattered the claims of the insolent monopoly. These and similar vexations chiefly served to enhance his reputation and establish his Congregation more firmly.

De la Salle now became the champion of popular education. He fought its first battles, and won its first victories. It was not celebrity that he courted; he wanted but the liberty of doing good. He clearly saw the imperfections of the existing methods of instruction. They were many and radical. The individual system seemed to him admirably adapted to favor idleness and loss of time. He rejected it as a whole, substituting in its stead the "simultaneous" method, by which the teacher addresses himself to a numerous division, generally to a whole class, at a time. The change was an immense progress. It gave a grand impetus to education. It increased tenfold the efficiency of the master, and diminished his drudgery while insuring substantial results.

Had De la Salle done no more than this he would have well

deserved to be classed among the friends and benefactors of truth. This bold innovation has alone done more for the advancement of primary education and the general diffusion of knowledge than most of the reforms of later educationists. We often hear of Pestalozzi and his methods; and, notwithstanding the ringing phrases of his panegyrists, we are unable to see that his achievements warrant the reputation he seems to have gained. According to himself he had an "unrivalled incapacity" for governing others, and he even admits that he could neither read, write, nor cipher respectably. As to the efficiency of his methods, Ramsauer, who was one of his favorite disciples, tells us that "*he* got as much regular schooling as the other pupils, namely, none at all." Admirers may comment upon his "devoted love," and may even wax warm over his "burning zeal." Pestalozzi seems to us a mere enthusiast, and his methods little else than visible eccentricities.

Among the educational reformers whose names have been trumpeted down to our times we may mention Jacotot and Lancaster. Jacotot was unquestionably a clever man, but his methods were too extravagant to outlive their originator. As to Lancaster, we need only enter a government school in London or Liverpool to realize, at a glance, the numerous and grievous drawbacks of his system. It is indeed much to the credit of English teachers that they have borne so long with so wretched a system. Compared with these educators the merits of De la Salle are transcendent.

But De la Salle did more than dismiss an imperfect and effete system from schools, and replace it by another which has worked successfully during the last two centuries; he remodelled the whole plan of studies. Up to his time Latin was the basis of elementary education. The first book which the child had to finger was a psalter. Of course he understood nothing of what he read; and, if we suppose it part of the master's duty to correct false quantities, then his must have been a rude task. When the boy read fluently (for he never read correctly), and had mastered the rudiments of Latin grammar, he was allowed to take up the study of his own language.

Such a course appears to us simply preposterous, and so it did to Fénelon, to the philosophers of Port Royal, and to De la Salle. It was, however, no easy matter to overthrow a long-established custom; but De la Salle never quailed before difficulties. Convinced of the necessity of abolishing the illogical system, he led the way. In all his schools the mother tongue was the first the little learner was made to lisp; and it was only when fairly proficient in French that he was taught to read Latin. The change roused many wrathful critics, who railed and stormed at the reformer; but nothing daunted by their fierce attacks he continued

to build up his great national (cosmopolitan ?) system on this foundation. The success of his schools at length disarmed criticism, and won him the approbation of the universities and of the highest authorities in Church and State.

Soon after this we find him heading another important work, viz., an institution to train competent masters for country schools. This was the natural outgrowth of his great undertaking. In 1685 he opened his *Seminaire de Maîtres d'Ecole*. It was the first training school, and therefore the antetype of the normal schools and training colleges of our own days. Candidates for admission were required to pass a preliminary examination. The discipline of the house was strict but parental,—De la Salle understood no other,—and the course of studies was remarkably comprehensive. Indeed, although two hundred years have elapsed since it was drawn up, it is coextensive with the *programmes d'études* framed for training schools at different times by the French Ministry of Public Instruction and, notably, with that issued in 1851.

This again shows the clearness with which De la Salle apprehended the wants of his time, and the thoroughness with which he provided for them. In another important question, too, he anticipated a movement which is commonly supposed to have had its origin in a progressive age. In 1699 he established regular public courses in science and art. The classes were held on Sundays from 12 to 3, and instruction was given by the Brothers in mathematics, drawing, and architecture. The most astonishing feature in this innovation is doubtless that the classes were held on Sunday, and, next to this, the courses were given free of charge. People of a Puritanic turn may be shocked at what they may consider an infraction of the Sabbath ; but our modern zealots, whose rallying-cry is " Educate the people, educate the masses," will surely not disapprove so useful an employment of the Sunday. Perhaps also they will henceforth think more highly of a body of men who give the people sound instruction in science and art without asking for any fees. But be it said, *en passant*, these social regenerators of ours indulge, by times, in much vapid declamation. Real knowledge or " solid thoughts " on the subject, they seem to have none. Their addresses to meetings, their communications to the daily press, show a discreditable amount of ignorance of the history and philosophy of education, while their acts and projects but too frequently remind one of the schemes and feats of the mad Knight of La Mancha. We would advise these irrepressible declaimers to profit by their first leisure and read a few chapters of some such book as the *Monks of the West*, the *Christian Schools and Scholars*, the *Ages of Faith*, or even *Maitland's Dark Ages* ; and before they commit themselves to any further public utterances, we would



strongly recommend them to read something about De la Salle's methods and educational triumphs.

It was in 1699 that the Sunday courses were begun; but long before this epoch-making date the name of De la Salle had spread throughout the country. It finally reached the Court, and the Brothers found in Madame de Maintenon a generous patroness. The Grand Monarque himself took notice of the growing institute, and in 1690 gave a remarkable proof of the esteem in which he held the illustrious priest and his society. The episode is of historic interest. After the defeat of the Boyne, James II. withdrew to France, whither many of his gallant officers, after vainly trying to retrieve their losses, followed him. Louis XIV. appreciated their fidelity to their fallen king, and provided for them and their children in a princely manner. He confided their daughters to an illustrious Sisterhood, and proposed to give their sons positions in the army. But these noble exiles were only imperfectly acquainted with the customs and language of their adopted country; they required instruction and refinement before being introduced to society and presented to Court. Louis XIV. consulted eminent authorities, and was advised by them to intrust the noble little band to the Abbé de la Salle. The worthy priest saw in the demand an expression of the designs of Providence that the time had come to extend the usefulness of his society, and accordingly he hastened to open a boarding-school. The hopeful young Irishmen, fifty in number, were warmly received, and soon found a cheerful and comfortable home with the Brothers. De la Salle superintended their education, selecting his ablest masters to give them the instruction suited to their age and position; and so well did these teachers respond to the confidence placed in them that in a short time the young exiles were able to fill with credit, the various offices and posts of honor to which they were appointed. As may be expected, James II. took a lively interest in them. Accompanied by the Archbishop of Paris, he visited the school, and, delighted at seeing them so well cared for, testified his gratitude to M. de la Salle and to the Brothers in the most honorable terms.

It may seem that the opening of this boarding-school was due to purely adventitious circumstances. This is only apparently true. Such establishments formed an integral part of the system of education drawn up by De la Salle, and bequeathed to his successors. They were necessary to supply a great want. The extreme orders of society were now fairly provided for; a gap, however, separated the few, and it was the founder's intention to bridge it over as soon as he could by the creation of boarding-schools. To his other

merits he thus added that of giving a great stimulus to middle-class education.

We have just seen De la Salle considering the demand of Louis XIV. as an expression of the will of heaven. As a man of eminent piety and learning he was wont to see in the march of events the guiding hand of an ever-watching Providence. The spirit of faith was his compass, and it knew no variation. By its influence he interpreted events, one of which had lasting consequences for his institute. It seems to have been his intention from the outset that some of his disciples should take Holy Orders, so as to be the spiritual directors of their respective communities. But he proceeded slowly in order to proceed surely. He singled out from among his earliest followers a man of rare ability, whom he wished to prepare for the priesthood. But this promising subject was carried off by a premature death, and the designs of De la Salle frustrated. This sinister event was to him a warning from above, and he hastened to write in his rule that no member of his Congregation should aspire to the ecclesiastical state. This gave the new institute an essentially lay character, which was a departure from custom, and therefore an innovation. It was an innovation, however, that gave permanency to the Society, securing to it an order of talent that might eventually have been transplanted to other fields of labor. The Brother of the Christian Schools is thus the "pioneer of the various lay teaching Orders by which he is surrounded."

De la Salle was eminent not only for his piety, but also for his learning. Of this he gave repeated proofs in his dealings with the Jansenists. These wily sectaries frequently tried to entangle him in their meshes. They were warm in his praises, and affected great zeal for the development of his work. They even helped him to open a novitiate in Marseilles, and encouraged young men to enter. They at last fancied they had fairly entrapped the unsuspecting priest. They then agreed to a public conference, in which the points at issue should be discussed. Guarded at first in their expressions, they soon threw off the mask. They sneered at Mgr. de Belsunce—"Marseilles' good Bishop," as Pope calls him—and derided the orthodox doctrine. They pointed their arguments by referring to De la Salle, then present, as one of their own. He instantly rose to repel the charge, and "in language borrowed from the purest sources, and with an eloquence that the occasion created, he proved the fallacy of the position which he had just heard assumed. Never had he felt the importance of not being misunderstood more than on the present occasion, and never were his enemies worse confounded. They were surprised at his manly defence." Thus writes one of his biographers.

Not abashed by this public repudiation of their sect, the Jansenists tried other means to win over so influential a man to their party. They vainly offered him bribes, and tempted him with ecclesiastical dignities. Changing their tactics, they then endeavored to break up the noviciate and destroy the schools; but, failing in all these attacks, they determined to open their last battery. They printed a libellous pamphlet, and circulated it far and wide. They hoped to drive their enemy out of the city, his retreat being their triumph. But he boldly stood his ground and replied to their fire. This he owed to the faith he professed, as well as to the Brothers of his institute. "He, therefore," says his latest biographer, "prepared a memoir, in which, while speaking mildly of the character of his maligners, he tore their doctrinal errors to shreds. His victory was complete. His friends, who had known him principally because of his virtues, now found, to their great delight, that he was one of the ablest, though most modest, champions of the Church against the errors of Jansenism and its hypocritical followers."

Soon after this, Clement XI. issued the famous Bull *Unigenitus*, which crushed Jansenism under its latest form of Quietism. De la Salle read and explained the document to his Brothers, and published an elaborate defence, which again drew down upon him the wrath of the irritated sectaries.

It had long been his ambition to go to Rome and solicit in person from the Holy Father canonical recognition for his new Order. While yet residing at Marseilles he determined to avail himself of a favorable opportunity, and secured a berth on board a ship bound for Civita Vecchia. He had even gone down to the quay, and was on the point of embarking, when he perceived Mgr. de Belunce hastening towards him. A good opportunity of opening a new school had just occurred, and the great bishop urged the importance of not neglecting it. De la Salle acquiesced; and, returning home, humorously said to his astonished community: "Behold me back from Rome!"

He had already founded a house in the Eternal City, and intrusted its direction to one of the most prominent men among his earliest disciples. He was cordially attached to the Holy See, and ever wished to show his loyal submission to the successor of Peter by signing himself *Roman priest*.

We have now briefly alluded to the leading events in De la Salle's life, and endeavored to sketch the bolder creations of his genius. And genius he unquestionably had, whether we give the term its usual meaning or define it as "the infinite power of taking pains." He was original in his conceptions, and considered no detail too minute that might in any way contribute to the harmo-

nious development of his plans. He foresaw everything, calculated his chances, and confidently abided his time. His life is an illustration of the saying, "To know how to wait is the great secret of success." His amiable manners and intelligent energy triumphed over difficulties before which many of a more herculean mould would have failed. He organized his Society with rare tact and sagacity, so much so that De Bonald, speaking of his code of rules, calls it a "masterpiece of wisdom and knowledge of men." For forty years he led the educational movement in France; he identified himself with it, and became one of the glories of the great age in which he lived. After four decades of unwearied labor, after firmly establishing his Order, this great and good man went to his heavenly reward. He died at Rouen, April 7th, 1719, in the sixty-eighth year of his age. Posterity has classed him among the benefactors of humanity, his country has raised his statue,<sup>1</sup> and the Church, mindful of his virtues and heroic sanctity, has conferred upon him the title of Venerable.

The grand work of the Venerable de la Salle continued to prosper down to the time of the Revolution. The men of 1789, who spared no one in their blind fury, imprisoned some of the Brothers and scattered the rest. But Italy kept alive the sacred fire; the Communities of Orvieto and Ferrara escaping the proscription of the French army, and thus maintaining the unbroken continuity of the institute. In 1806 Napoleon re-established the Society by imperial decree, pointedly remarking to those who discountenanced the measure: "I do not know what sort of fanaticism some persons manifest against the Brothers; everywhere I am asked to re-establish them. This general cry shows their utility. The least that Catholics can expect is equality; and certainly thirty millions of men deserve as much consideration as three millions."<sup>2</sup> Since that period the Order has steadily progressed and wonderfully developed. It is now no longer confined to its native country. It has crossed the seas, and its beneficent action is felt in almost

---

<sup>1</sup> This magnificent monument, erected in Rouen, was unveiled with national splendor and ceremony in June, 1875. It represents the Venerable de la Salle in a pleasing attitude, with all his grace and benignity; it shows the arms of his noble house, of his institute, of Rheims and of Rouen. One of the bas-reliefs represents him in the act of distributing his patrimony to the poor, whilst another commemorates the visit of James II. The corners are held by children, who typify the four quarters of the earth, and from the base gush forth limpid streams, which symbolize the instruction plentifully poured out on the four parts of the globe by the Venerable de la Salle and his disciples.

<sup>2</sup> "Je ne conçois l'espèce de fanatisme dont quelques uns sont animés contre les Frères. Partout on me demande leur rétablissement; ce cri général démontre assez bien leur utilité. La moindre chose qui puisse être demandée pour les Catholiques, c'est sans doute l'égalité, car trente millions d'hommes méritent autant de considération que trois millions."

every land. The Order speaks all tongues. Instance the "heathen Chinese" in the language of Confucius; Arabic in Alexandria, and modern Greek in the streets of Constantinople. It is truly cosmopolitan. Faithful to the spirit of its founder, it directs parochial schools and academies, training schools and colleges. It numbers 14,000 members, and we are glad to learn that the bulk of this phalanx has for years been engaged in the battle of religious education against secularism and infidelity. France, and especially Paris, has been the theatre of this long struggle, as it is at the present hour of a fierce and desperate onset. All credit to the Brothers, who have never wavered, never blanched in the fight. Over and over again they have met their antagonists in the lists of public competition, and *as often* have they worsted them in the strife. They have never declined a combat, never lost a victory.

## COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.

YEAR.	SCHOLARSHIPS.	BROTHERS.		SECULARS.	
		SCHOLARSHIPS.	AMONG FIRST 20.	SCHOLARSHIPS.	AMONG FIRST 20.
1848	31	27	17	4	3
1849	32	31	20	1	0
1850	32	24	17	8	3
1851	40	28	15	12	5
1852	40	33	18	7	2
1853	40	31	15	9	5
1854	40	32	17	8	3
1855	40	32	17	8	3
1856	40	36	17	4	3
1857	40	36	20	4	0
1858	40	38	19	2	1
1859	40	34	18	6	2
1860	40	34	17	6	3
1861	40	35	17	5	3
1862	40	31	15	9	5
1863	40	34	17	6	3
1864	40	30	15	10	5
1865	40	37	19	3	1
1866	40	29	17	11	3
1867	40	35	16	5	4
1868	40	38	20	2	0
1869	50	30	14	20	6
1870	50	41	17	9	3
Lycées	40	28	15	12	5
1871	50	33	16	17	4
1872	50	36	16	14	4
1873	50	32	16	18	4
1874	80	64	19	16	1
1875	80	55	14	25	6
1876	80	67	19	13	1
1877	100	77	18	23	2
1878	100	83	18	17	2

We have gone to some trouble to obtain the foregoing details of the open competitions for the scholarships annually given away by the city of Paris, and we are glad that we have succeeded. Their publication is all the more opportune as the municipal authorities of Paris have just decided to turn the Brothers out of their schools. We commend these figures to the notice of all who take any interest in the educational question, but more especially to those who think that religious teaching should be banished from the classroom.

The table speaks for itself. It is a glorious refutation of the aspersions and calumnies thrown out by the partisans of a godless education. The logic of such figures is telling. Thirty-one contests and thirty-one victories! Then again out of 1545 scholarships, 1231 (the lion's share) are won by the Brothers, leaving a balance of 314 to their opponents. The success is overwhelming. It places beyond cavil the superiority of the "clerical" schools, a superiority due in part to the masters and in part to their methods.

In the light of such facts we can well understand the praises bestowed on the Brothers by two great statesmen *inter multos*. One of these is Guizot. "I rejoice," says the historian of civilization, "to see the Brothers engaged in the work of education; by their devotedness, by their science, by their methods they will give a powerful impetus to true progress. Our industrial, artistic, and commercial classes will here find all the knowledge they require for their various careers in life." Now hear Thiers: "For many years I have been a supporter of the University, a systematic supporter. Well, I declare to-day that I would wish to see the Brothers not only in our cities, but in all our country towns and villages."<sup>1</sup>

To the above we shall add just one testimony, viz., that of the London *Times*. It writes: "It would be difficult to find a body of men more self-sacrificing and better able to fulfil the task they have undertaken than the Brothers. Their affable ways, their excellent discipline, their talent for education, their thorough devotedness to their work commend them to the respect and admiration even of Protestants."

<sup>1</sup> "Je me rejouis de voir les Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes dans le ministère de notre éducation; par leur dévouement, par leur science, par leur enseignement, ils donneront le branle au véritable progrès. Nos générations industrielles, artistiques et commerçantes trouveront ici tous les aliments intellectuels qui conviennent à leur vie, à leur destinée."

<sup>2</sup> "J'ai été longtemps universitaire, systématiquement universitaire. Eh bien, je déclare aujourd'hui que je voudrais voir les Frères non pas seulement dans les villes, mais aussi dans tous les bourgs et tous les villages."

But the oft-defeated secularists differ *toto celo* in opinion from Guizot, Thiers, and the *Times*. Their hopeless failures kindled their wrath and fanned it into flame. They cudgelled their brains for some means of putting down the Brothers, and at last they hit upon a plan, which to their mind must infallibly strip their irrepressible rivals of their prestige, and ultimately sound the death-knell. They cried out that the Brothers crammed their best boys, to the detriment of the less promising, and they confidently appealed to the University to inquire into the matter. The University did inquire into the matter by applying a test in the shape of a *Certificat d'Etudes* granted to all deserving scholars. The efficiency of a school was of course to be measured by the number of such certificates obtained. The first examination of the kind was held in 1869, on which occasion the Brothers simply doubled the average of the secular teachers. Similar results were obtained each succeeding year, as the following table shows :

QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS.

YEAR.	CLERICALS.		SECULARS.	
	CERTIFICATES.	AVERAGE PER SCHOOL.	CERTIFICATES.	AVERAGE PER SCHOOL.
1869	274	5.48	177	2.76
1870	419	7.76	264	4.06
1872	471	8.72	341	4.94
1873	421	7.80	322	4.35
1874	601	11.13	483	6.35
1875	711	13.17	593	7.32
1876	692	12.81	656	7.63
1877	687	12.72	755	8.67
1878	780	14.44	852	8.78

The University test, which was intended to show up the tricks of the Brothers and mathematically demonstrate the inferiority of their schools, thus defeated the hopes of its framers. It served only to make more patent and to give greater publicity to the marked superiority of the Christian schools. But if the secular teachers were everywhere checkmated, the partisans of secularism

—irate at their complete discomfiture—resolved to make a combined effort to repress their troublesome rivals. Unable to cope with them in the lists, unable to meet them in fair open fight, they have at last resorted to the *argumentum ad baculum*, to brute force. The municipal council of Paris has already voted their expulsion, and several provincial towns have emulated the capital. At Blois and a few other places they have been literally ejected by the *gens-d'armes*. But the people stood by the instructors of their children, and on the very morrow of their ejection they were able to hold their classes in new premises, the scholars, to a boy, rallying round their persecuted masters. But this is not all. While ediles decree their suppression, deputies are busy contriving a piece of legal machinery (the scavenger's daughter of the nineteenth century) which will not merely hamper but effectively cripple and crush the offensive Brotherhood. While we are going to press these warm friends (?) of liberty are engaged upon a schedule to subject the Brothers to military service. If this bill pass the Chambers the cassock will have to be thrown aside for the uniform, and the school abandoned for the barracks. Such a measure, we have reason to think, would be productive of disastrous results for the main body of the institute.

We consider the fiery ordeal through which the Brothers in France are now passing as one of the finest pages in their history. We certainly admired their bravery on the battle-field which forced a general to cry out to them that humanity and charity did not require them to venture so far, and induced another to dismount in order to embrace one of them whom he met under the enemy's guns; we certainly admired the retiring modesty they displayed when the French Academy awarded them the prize offered by the city of Boston for the noblest deeds of patriotism accomplished during the Franco-Prussian War; and we admired them again the other day when they went up to receive from the chief of the State the rewards they had won at the Paris Exhibition, viz., five gold, five silver, and three bronze medals; but we say without hesitation that they appear to us more worthy of admiration now on account of the persecution which their brilliant scholastic results have brought down upon them. It is because they are the leaders of popular education, because they are too successful, because they totally eclipse the secularists that they are marked out for destruction. They must now expiate their grand educational triumphs. It is here their death-warrant is signed, but it is equally true that *quos deus vult perdere, prius dementat*. That the demagogues are demented few will deny, who read our daily papers. They are infuriated against what they disdainfully call "clericalism," and



resort to excessive measures to check and extirpate it. They forget the warning which one of their own conveys to them in the line,

Le trône a succombé par excès de puissance.

They never cease talking about liberty and the era they are inaugurating ; but their liberty is a grinding tyranny. Their excesses will be their ruin.

But while the Order is persecuted in France, it continues to extend and prosper in other countries. Spain has just welcomed its first colony of Brothers, and the Moslems of Jerusalem have shown no aversion to their sable costume. In England they scarcely muster a hundred members, and yet have several extensive establishments. In Liverpool they have taken out government certificates, and the Blue Books show that Her Majesty's inspectors give them excellent reports. In London they have a college where young men are prepared for public examinations, and especially for the University of London.

It is only thirty years since the first pioneers of the Order came over to our shores, and already there are over 1200 Brothers scattered throughout the country from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, from New York to San Francisco. Here, as in France, they devote themselves with energy to their great and laborious work, and it is gratifying to notice the marked success that everywhere attends their efforts.

The Order thus continues in every clime its grand educational traditions, and in every land reaps the same harvest of results. We cordially say *floreat semper*.

---

## RECENT PROGRESS IN STELLAR PHYSICS.

AS a witness of unparalleled progress in all sciences, especially those which are termed experimental, the present century stands pre-eminent. No proof of this assertion is demanded, for the astounding progress of the age has become so trite and commonplace an expression that it is in every one's mouth. What giant strides in the science of the day do not steam and electricity mark? Our fathers in their boyhood days felt not the absence of these two useful agents; but how could we survive their loss? Photography, too, and the thousand discoveries in modern chemistry as applied to the arts and to agriculture, manifest the wonderful advance of science.

Astronomy, likewise, in its experimental features, can boast of following, or I should say rather of leading other sciences in the onward march of progress; a superiority due, in no slight degree, to the perfection and ingenuity exhibited in our modern instruments of celestial research. To mention a few familiar facts will be a sufficient voucher for the statement. Since the year 1800, when Piazzi discovered the first, all that group of celestial bodies termed asteroids, forming, according to Bode's law, the "missing link" between the planets Mars and Jupiter, has been added to our store of astronomical knowledge. In the Smithsonian Report for 1876 the number of these dwarf planets noted up to that date is given as 172; the last, if I mistake not, discovered in July by Professor Peters, of Clinton, N. Y., is the 200th in the list.

Again, the mathematical prophecy by Leverrier of Neptune's existence, and its subsequent discovery are familiar to all our readers. Then there is Professor Hall's discovery of Mars's satellites in August, 1877; and Professor Watson's glimpse of at least one intra-mercurial planet obtained on July 29th, 1878. Tables, also, of all the planets, together with that of our own satellite, have been carefully compiled, studied, and corrected. Besides, the periodical nature of comets has been ascertained, and the time of revolution of several of these erratic wanderers from the influence of other solar centres has been calculated and confidently predicted.

But to approach nearer our subject—the stars; in stellar astronomy, as distinct from astronomy in general, important results have been reached. Very correct stellar charts or maps have been completed after a careful and laborious study of ancient and modern catalogues; the most renowned among the latter being Lalande's, Argelander's, Rümker's, Baily's, Airy's, Weisse's, Groombridge's, Johnson's, Carrington's, and Santini's. The distribution of the stars has been more exactly studied, and their number com-

puted with greater accuracy by the two Herschels and their successors in that study; so that the best authorities state that by the help of our most powerful instruments more than 20,000,000 of the stellar orbs have been rendered visible.

The ancients regarded the stars as literally fixed; modern research has ascertained that many, perhaps all, have a certain motion. This motion is small, in an angular direction, many stars describing an arc of only 1" per annum, and none ever exceeding 6" or 7". It is more apparent for large than for small stars, so that the opinion hitherto advanced, that the smaller stars appear so by reason of their greater distance, acquires hereby additional probability.

Since 1802, when William Herschel first announced the existence of physical systems of double stars (*i. e.*, systems of bodies connected as the planets are with the sun, and acting on each other according to Kepler's laws), their number has been greatly augmented, nearly 6000 being so far enumerated. Some may belong to the class of optical double stars, *i. e.*, stars which are near only in appearance, being in reality far apart and independent of each other.

The variable stars, whether periodical or temporary, have not evaded the sweeping research of the astronomer. The nebulae, too, have been attentively examined and many of this class resolved into distinct stars. This study has, furthermore, revealed the fact that the nebulae change their original shape, as Professor Holden asserted some years since with regard to two of them.

To attempt a detailed account of the several subjects touched upon, and of those whose enumeration has been omitted for the sake of brevity, would far surpass the limits of an article. Besides many of them are so involved in technicalities as to lose all interest for the general reader. Let us, then, select a subject to which we have not hitherto alluded, namely, that field of astronomy first entered upon about a quarter of a century ago, when the then newly invented spectroscope inaugurated the science of stellar physics. We propose, therefore, to lay before the readers of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* as plain an exposition of the progress resulting from the application of that wondrous little instrument to the far-off heavenly orbs, as the subject-matter will permit.

In this branch of astronomy, which is essentially experimental, it is requisite from the start to distinguish between well-ascertained facts and the theories built thereupon. The established facts constitute the bulwark of the science, while the theories resting upon these and deduced from them are liable to change; as in chemistry the discovery of new facts has often sounded the signal for the suppression of some pet theory which failed to meet their explanation. It should be remarked, however, that where mechanical principles

are involved the theory remains thus far intact, since these principles are as certain as the facts themselves.

Now the spectroscope brought to bear upon the stellar world gives us a glimpse of these bodies which enables us to point out a solid, a liquid, or a gaseous star. It registers their relative temperature, measures the tension of their atmospheric vapors, singles out the component elements which constitute them, and lastly detects their backward or forward motion in the direction of the visual ray. A motion which, when exactly measured and compared with the angular motion mentioned above, will disclose to us a satisfactory knowledge of the nature of the stellar orbits.

But how does the spectroscope lead us to this knowledge?

Before answering this question we deem it not out of place, first to offer the general reader a hurried description of the instrument, which has so vastly enriched our astronomic lore, together with a hint regarding the way in which it is employed, and then glide rapidly over the steps leading to our present knowledge of stellar spectroscopy. An ordinary spectroscope comprises essentially three parts; a collimator, serving to render the beam of light parallel, one or more prisms, and a telescope designed to examine the dispersed light or spectrum. Direct view spectroscopes combine these parts in one straight tube, the prism being replaced by two prismatic systems so arranged that one set counteracts the deviation caused by the other, without affecting in the same manner the dispersion. Either kind, or a combination of the two, serves also for a stellar spectroscope; these last, though, are supplied with a powerful telescope to increase the intensity of the light. It is likewise found necessary to employ a cylindrical lens, otherwise the spectrum of a star would be a mere line, since any so-called fixed star, even in the field of the most powerful telescope, appears as a point. With the cylindrical lens the difficulty is obviated; the spectral colors as well as the dark bands being sufficiently widened and separated for detection. How simple an apparatus to accomplish the wondrous achievements indicated above!

With regard to its employment, let us remark that compound light like compound sound, to which it is comparable, contains several elementary vibrations which by their superposition form the compound beam. When such a beam of light passes through a prism it is deviated; the red the least, the violet the most; between these the other colors are located. This constitutes what is termed a spectrum. Now when we examine an incandescent solid or liquid body the spectrum is continuous. Gases under ordinary conditions give a band spectrum, termed direct band spectrum. If a metallic vapor be interposed between a spectroscope and a luminous source much hotter and brighter than the vapor, and also capable of pro-

ducing a continuous spectrum, then some of the light of the continuous spectrum will be absorbed, and the spectrum given will contain dark lines perpendicular to its length. A familiar example of this absorption spectrum, containing the well-known Fraunhofer lines, is that given by the sun.

This able experimenter, by whose name the lines of the solar spectrum are known, was the first to obtain spectra of the heavenly bodies other than that of the sun. He produced spectra of the moon, planets, and comets, which reflect sunlight, and announced them to be of the same kind as the solar spectrum; this assertion subsequent experiments fully substantiated. A slight dissimilarity, however, has been lately detected in the spectrum of Uranus and the comets. Fraunhofer also noted dark lines in the spectra of the stars, and observed that they were differently located from those in the solar spectrum. Others zealously followed in the steps of Fraunhofer, but satisfactory results were not obtained until Huggins, Miller, and the late Fr. Secchi, S. J., took the subject in hand. The work of the first is remarkable for delicacy and accuracy of detail. The labor of the lamented Jesuit embraced a more numerous collection of stars. Some ten years ago Schellen spoke thus of these pioneers in stellar chemistry: "When it is remembered that the light of the stars, and especially that of *nebulæ* and comets, is very faint, and that in a northern climate there are but few nights favorable for the observation of these delicate objects, in which their light is neither overpowered by the moon nor obscured by mist or cloud; and when it is further borne in mind that, since the instruments participate in the daily revolution of the earth, a complicated driving clock is requisite for giving them a contrary motion, by which the image of a star may be kept stationary for some time in the field of view; some idea may be formed of the difficulties inseparable from the investigations of the heavenly bodies by spectrum analysis, and some proper estimate made of the services of such men as Angelo Secchi, director of the Observatory at the Collegio Romano at Rome; William Huggins, of Upper Tuke Hill; and William Allen Miller, Vice-President of the Royal Society, who have won for themselves well-merited honor by their untiring zeal and energy in overcoming so many obstacles." Before his death, Fr. Secchi had classified the spectra of 4000 stars. Fr. Ferrari, Fr. Secchi's disciple and successor, was continuing this laudable work when the Italian Government removed him from the observatory.

Numbers have devoted their energy to the prosecution of this study; but as a classification of stellar spectra in types, "which," as Lockyer remarked in a lecture before the Royal Institution of Great Britain, "has been indicated by Fr. Secchi with admirable

philosophy," sums up the general facts pertaining to this subject, we shall endeavor to reproduce it in substance, as found in his last work, *Le Stelle*, 1878.

The spectra, he remarks, of the majority of the stars thus far accurately examined with the spectroscope can, with few exceptions, be reduced to four general types. The first comprises the spectra of  $\alpha$  *Lyræ*, *Sirius*, the most brilliant star in the heavens, and most of those which shine with a white or bluish-white light, such as *Vega*, *Regulus*, *Rigel*, and the stars of the Great Bear except  $\alpha$  *Ursæ*. To this type belong more than half of the visible stars. The spectra of this class exhibit the seven colors, the yellow and red being somewhat faint when the bluish light predominates. They are crossed at times by several dark lines; four, which are always present, being quite broad, correspond to the four brightest lines (H,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ) in the spectrum of hydrogen as produced by means of Geissler tubes. A few of the brightest stars, as *Sirius*, besides these characteristic lines, exhibit in their spectra lines easily detected corresponding to the metals sodium, iron, and magnesium.

The spectra of the second type resemble that of the sun. The stars belonging to this group, such as *Arcturus*, *Capella*, *Pollux*, *Aldebaran*,  $\alpha$  *Ursæ*, and *Procyon*, are numerous and of a yellow tint. In their spectra the lines are quite fine, requiring a very pure atmosphere to insure their detection. Lines corresponding to hydrogen are observed, but are not so heavy and prominent as those given by the first type. It should be remarked that these lines undergo a change in intensity with the variation of color in the stars, being darker and longer, for instance, in *Arcturus* and *Aldebaran* during their florid period than at other times; the sodium line also becoming less well defined. Moreover, the spectra of these stars seem at times to pass into those of the third type.

To the third type belong about one hundred stars of the first and second magnitudes. Of this group,  $\alpha$  *Orionis*,  $\beta$  *Pegasi*, and  $\alpha$  *Her- culis* are examples. The spectra of these stars, which are mostly red, appear like a row of columns illuminated from the side, producing a pleasing stereoscopic effect; when the bright bands become narrower, then the dark lines take the appearance of a series of grooves. The lines of absorption in these spectra are rather bands than lines; those of hydrogen, however, remain faint, and are at times wanting, while the sodium, iron, and magnesium lines are well marked. The spectra of this group appear to be double, one comprising ill-defined luminous bands or columns over which a second containing dark metallic lines is projected. In some, these dark lines are readily distinguishable, in others they are seen with difficulty. The spectra of this type resemble those of the solar spots.

The last type, which comprises stars not exceeding the sixth

magnitude, exhibits considerable variety. The spectra are column-like in appearance, as those of the third type, but differing from them in this, that these fluted columns are more luminous on the violet side, while the greatest intensity is found on the red side in those of the third group. In some spectra, however, of this type, the bands are uniformly illuminated; in others, here and there, bright lines are noticed. A singularity in these spectra is the presence of a yellow line not coinciding with the D line of sodium. Some idea of the spectra of the third and fourth types is presented by a Geissler tube filled with nitrogen under low pressure, through which the electric spark at a medium temperature is passed, a series of layers being produced resembling the columns alluded to.

The most remarkable exceptions of stars not reducible to these types are  $\gamma$  *Cassiopeiae* and  $\beta$  *Lyrae*, which give a direct spectrum of bright lines similar to that obtained in the laboratory by examining a glowing gas with the spectroscope.

Such are the leading facts which the spectroscope teaches us regarding the single stars; later on we may find space to mention those pertaining to double and variable stars; the shifting of certain lines in the spectra of the stars may also claim our attention.

But let us return to the question proposed above. How does the spectroscope acquaint us with facts belonging to these heavenly bodies? The stellar light, like a faithful messenger, conveys to us news regarding those distant orbs, but the message is couched in a strange tongue, which we must strive to interpret. As the aerial telegraph of old transmitted information afar which could be understood if conventional signs were known; so in the present case we must confer with nature and study her symbols before we can penetrate the secrets of her starry worlds. In experimental sciences we proceed from the more known phenomena to an explanation of those which are involved in obscurity or encompassed with difficulties. This shall be our method of procedure here, our knowledge of the sun giving us the clue to explain the meaning of the bands and lines noticed in stellar spectra. This method is perfectly legitimate, since there is no sharp line of demarcation between our sun and the stars; the sun being a star towards which gravitate the planets, their satellites, and numerous comets,—a star, too, which, with its attendant worlds, travels through space as the so-called fixed stars. Only the general direction of the solar orbit through the heavens is known to us, yet this motion becomes daily more probable, and it has been lately suggested that the pendulum may afford us a mathematical demonstration of it, as it does of the earth's rotation.

Relatively the sun is a small star, according to the estimate of some astronomers, being only of the sixth magnitude, and its

distance, ninety odd millions of miles, is not great when compared with the distance of the nearest stars, which are estimated to be twenty millions of millions of miles from the earth. It presents an appreciable diameter and hence favors observation. Now, direct observations made on the sun with telescopes and other instruments yield results which harmonize perfectly with those which the spectroscope discloses when directed on the same body. Thus when Galileo directed his telescope upon the solar disk it revealed to him the well-known sun-spots. To explain these phenomena various theories were advanced, but astronomers were finally led to regard them as cavities existing in the solar atmosphere; now the spectroscope brought to bear on these spots leads to identically the same conclusion. Again, it has been ascertained by direct experiment with the telescope that the sun is a periodical star, varying at intervals of about eleven and a half years; these periods, which have a close connection with many changes on our globe, can be ascertained by the use of the spectroscope. Here, then, we have a clue to the explanation of phenomena attending other variable stars.

In summing up the facts which the spectroscope reveals regarding the sun, it is advisable to distinguish, with Lockyer, two epochs. During the first, which terminated about ten years ago, solar phenomena were examined as a whole; since that date, which marks the beginning of the second epoch, each phenomenon has been subjected to a separate examination. We will note briefly the progress made by pursuing the old method. From the time of Newton the solar spectrum excited the curiosity and claimed the attention of scientific men. Glimpses of the dark lines, so familiar at present, were caught by different investigators. To omit earlier labors, Fraunhofer, in 1814, drew up a map of six hundred lines, and announced his suspicion of some connection between the sodium line and a double black line which he observed in the solar spectrum. In 1841 Brewster had observed two thousand lines, and remarked the coincidence of certain lines with those given by a few of the metals; he also detected lines in the infra-red region of the spectrum, whilst Becquerel noticed similar lines in the ultra-violet. Kirchhoff, in 1859, experimentally established the existence of a fixed connection between the lines produced in the spectra of different substances and those found in the solar spectrum. In an address delivered before the Berlin Academy he annunciated the law in the following terms: "I conclude, further, that the dark lines of the solar spectrum, which are not evoked by the atmosphere of the earth, exist in consequence of the presence, in the incandescent atmosphere of the sun, of those substances which in the spectrum of a flame produce bright lines



at the same place." Hence he verified in the case of light the law long known for heat, namely, that the absorbing power of a body is equal to its radiating power. But why this connection? Is there any physical explanation why a certain vapor, that of sodium, for instance, should absorb precisely that light which it emits? Undoubtedly there is, and Stokes advanced the subjoined illustration even prior to Kirchoff's statement: "That a body may be at the same time a source of light giving out rays of a definite refrangibility, and an absorbing medium extinguishing rays of that same refrangibility which traverse it, seems readily to admit of a dynamical illustration borrowed from sound. We know that a stretched string which, on being struck, gives out a certain note (suppose its fundamental note), is capable of being thrown into the same states of vibration by aerial vibrations corresponding to the same note. Suppose now a portion of space to contain a great number of such stretched strings, forming thus the analogue of a 'medium.' It is evident that such a medium on being agitated would give out the note above mentioned; while, on the other hand, if that note were sounded in air at a distance, the incident vibrations would throw the strings into vibration, and consequently would themselves be gradually extinguished, since otherwise there would be a creation of *vis viva*. The optical application of this illustration is too obvious to need comment." To show still further the evidence of this illustration, let us consider the results given by passing through the vapor of sodium white calcium light. The vibrations producing this light are of different rates, like the sonorous vibrations constituting a compound sound. Now let us suppose the vibrations of the vapor to be of one uniform rate; then all the vibrations of the calcium light will pass through unchanged save that one identical with the rate at which the vapor of sodium is vibrating; this will be arrested by the vapor, spread over an extensive surface, and consequently will be wellnigh extinguished. The light, therefore, which will pass through can no longer give the color absorbed by the sodium. Kirchoff's method in investigating was that of mapping out and then instituting a comparison between the lines of the solar spectrum and those of the spectra of various substances. We meet, however, with two serious difficulties, which have been happily surmounted by the exertions of various investigators. The first was the need of a natural scale of measurement, his own being arbitrary, by means of which the results obtained with different instruments were not easily compared. To Augström is due the credit of introducing a scale based upon the length of light waves. This he accomplished by comparing the spectrum obtained with a prism with one formed by diffraction. As the lengths thus

measured are independent of the instrument employed, we have at once a natural scale of the spectral lines. The second difficulty was the necessity of determining the effect produced on the solar beam by the absorption of the terrestrial atmosphere. Brewster and Gladstone both detected the fact of this absorption, but failed to determine the full extent of its influence. The subject was thoroughly investigated by Janssen from 1864 to 1866, who discovered that it was mainly due to the presence of aqueous vapor, and he determined its precise action on the spectrum.

Had stellar chemistry made no further progress than what we have indicated, still our knowledge of the sun and stars could not be termed meagre. We could, in fact, with this knowledge determine respecting the sun, as well as those stars whose spectra are similar to the sun's, that their mass, whether a solid, a liquid, or possibly a gas under great pressure, must be at a very high temperature; that their nuclei are surrounded by an atmosphere whose constituents we could discover, etc. Let us consider a moment the solar spectrum with its well-known Fraunhofer lines. If the position of these lines be compared with those of the metals—which can be done by allowing the sun's light to fall upon one-half of the slit of a spectroscope, while the other half receives the light from an incandescent metallic vapor—then an exact coincidence will be observed between the lines of some metals and those given by the sun, and this not only in position but also in width and intensity. In this way several metals, fifteen at least, among which iron is predominant, have been found to exist in the solar atmosphere in a gaseous state.

But science was not disposed to halt. The new method of examining each solar phenomenon singly was introduced, and this has gradually led to an explanation of the difference noted in the stellar spectra, and to a knowledge of the physical condition of the stars; such as their comparative temperatures, their backward and forward motion in the direction of the visual ray, etc. But let us examine more in detail the features of the new method of observation, which bear upon the solution of these questions. Circumstances attending the eclipse of August 18th, 1868, may be said to have inaugurated the new method. In many preceding eclipses, notably that of 1842, luminous flames or prominences were observed darting out around the moon at the moment of total phase. In 1868 several skilful observers proceeded to India with the avowed purpose of determining by means of the spectroscope the nature of these flames. Success, in a great measure, crowned their efforts. Janssen, among others, found that these flames were produced mainly by hydrogen. But as the moments for favorable observation during an eclipse are very limited, the sub-

ject in question could not be thoroughly investigated, and it was thought that the zeal of scientific observers would be constrained to abide the coming of another total eclipse. Janssen and Lockyer came to the rescue, and independently discovered a method of observing the prominences with the spectroscope in full sunshine. Lockyer, some years previously, had expressed the opinion that perhaps it was possible, and he actually succeeded in effecting it October 24th, 1868; while on the 26th of the same month it was announced in the French Academy of Science that M. Janssen had reached the same result the day after the eclipse.

M. Faye, the eminent French astronomer, in a communication to the same Academy (November 2d, 1868), expressed himself thus regarding the question of priority: "Instead of endeavoring to apportion and therefore weaken the merit of discovery, is it not wiser to attribute the whole honor without reserve to both of these investigators, who, separated by some thousand miles, independently reached the untangible and invisible by a method the most surprising perhaps which the genius of observation has hitherto devised?"

Since this ingenious method is the key to subsequent discoveries, it is necessary to dwell somewhat on its explanation. Now let us suppose the slit of a very dispersive spectroscope to be directed perpendicularly upon the sun's edge, so that one-half of it only extends over the solar disk; then a double spectrum will be produced; one, the ordinary solar spectrum, caused by the disk of the sun; the second given by that portion of the terrestrial atmosphere which is opposite to the other half of the slit, and which is illuminated by the sun's rays. In this last, over a faint solar spectrum, bright lines will be remarked, of which the most noticeable are those of hydrogen, especially the C line, and a line in close proximity to the sodium line D. This phenomenon is constantly observed when on clear days the sun's edge is examined with a powerful telescope furnished with a very dispersive spectroscope. The only deviation noticed is that the lines are occasionally longer and brighter than usual, at which times they are often accompanied by some lines of the metals, magnesium, titanium, iron, manganese, calcium, chromium, sodium, and barium. Now the reason why this layer of solar atmosphere ordinarily visible during eclipses (to which the name of chromosphere has been given) is apparent in the spectroscope and not in the telescope when the sun is shining, is because the light of the terrestrial atmosphere overpowers it in the telescope; but when a line of light admitted through a slit is decomposed by a system of prisms, as happens in the spectroscope, the length of the spectrum produced can be lengthened at pleasure by simply multiplying the number of prisms; and as

the quantity of light remains the same it is evident that the intensity must diminish. Such is the result in the case of compound light which illuminates our atmosphere; if, however, the light be homogeneous, as the hydrogen light existing in the sun's chromosphere, it is simply deviated from its original direction by dispersion, but not reduced in intensity. Hence the lines corresponding to the homogeneous light of the chromosphere retain their intensity and eventually overpower the faint light of the spectrum produced by the terrestrial atmosphere, they alone remaining visible.

This method, furthermore, enables us to examine daily the protuberances which correspond to the longer and brighter lines mentioned above. Close observation, made either by placing the spectroscope as mentioned above or with its slit tangential to the sun's edge, which position exhibits the prominences to better advantage, has disclosed the fact that the sun's limb, especially during the period of solar spots, is often surrounded by these protuberances. At times they are noticed directly over a spot; they are, besides, subject to rapid mutations.

These observations have attracted much attention, and their study has been promoted both here and in Europe by eminent astronomers, such as Lockyer, Secchi, Young, Huggins, Rayet, Respighi, etc., with great success. Two phenomena here demand our attention as calculated to throw light upon the different types of stellar spectra. The first is the shifting observed in the position of the lines in the spectrum of the chromosphere, notably the hydrogen line C, when great changes occur in the prominences. The second is the great increase in width of the same lines. Both phenomena are also observed, at least partially, in the sun's disk when a solar spot is examined by the new method. To obtain a better idea of these phenomena let us suppose the slit of a dispersive spectroscope, attached to a large telescope, to be directed upon a solar spot, so that the slit covers the umbra, the penumbra, and the nearer side of the solar disk; then the disk will produce the ordinary solar spectrum with the usual lines; the penumbra will give a spectrum of the same kind with enlarged absorption lines; while the umbra will form a like spectrum, but fainter, containing wider lines, and occasionally in the middle of these enlarged lines a very fine bright line will be perceived. To this thickening of the lines must be added the shifting of the dark lines from side to side. A correct understanding of these phenomena, the increasing in width and shifting of the lines in the above-mentioned spectra, will clear up many difficulties encountered in the study of stellar spectra. With regard, then, to the increase in the width of the lines, the researches of Plücker, Cailletet, Hittorf, Frankland, and others,

have shown that this phenomenon is due to a change in the pressure or temperature of gases. Hydrogen, for instance, with medium rarefaction gives its three characteristic lines ( $H$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ). With diminished pressure the least refracting line ( $H\alpha$ ) disappears and the gas changes color. Under great pressure the lines increase in width and others make their appearance. Similar changes accompany a variation in temperature. Hence with a great pressure and a high temperature the hydrogen line spectrum is converted into a continuous one, resulting from the general widening of the lines. Now as absorption and radiation are proportional, it follows that a gas at a high temperature and under a considerable pressure will produce thick dark lines in its spectrum.

The foregoing facts furnish an explanation of solar spots, which are generally thought to be due to the absorption of light from the photosphere as produced by masses ejected from the interior of the sun.

These masses, when observed near the solar edge, take the form of flames, because they are then projected on a comparatively dark sky; but when observed over the luminous disk itself they produce absorption. Just as the sodium flame when interposed between the spectroscope and a dark background gives a bright yellow line, but a dark line is observed if the dark background be replaced by a luminous source.

Before applying these principles to the spectra given by the stars, it will be advisable to examine the displacement of the lines, notably the C hydrogen line in the spectrum of the solar spots. This displacement is attributed to the backward and forward motion of hydrogen gas in the direction of the visual ray. But why so? The analogous deportment of optical and acoustic phenomena furnishes the key to the explanation of this fact. It is found in acoustics that the tone of a sounding body is higher if the sounding body approaches the ear, and lower if it recedes, than the true tone of the body. A rough verification of this generally admitted theory, termed Doppler's principle, is readily remarked in the change of the tone of the whistle of a locomotive on moving towards or receding from us. The explanation is briefly this:

Under ordinary circumstances sound is propagated in air with a velocity of about three hundred and forty meters per second. Now suppose that a horseman, at the exaggerated speed of three hundred and forty meters per second, were to approach a sounding body, which is emitting four hundred vibrations per second, then the horseman's ear would receive twice four hundred vibrations, and the sound consequently would be raised to the octave. Hence the pitch of a sound will be raised or lowered proportionably to the speed with which one approaches the sounding body or recedes

from it. An analogous phenomenon is very striking in the phonograph, which raises or depresses the tone of the original notes sung into the instrument accordingly as the cylinder is rotated more or less rapidly. As the different vibratory rates in sound are accompanied by a change in pitch, so a difference of vibration in light motion produces the various colors. Since, however, the motion producing a change in the luminiferous vibration must be proportioned to the number of vibrations of different colors—four hundred and eighty billions for red, eight hundred billions for violet—this motion must be infinitely more rapid than that which can effect a change in the sonorous vibrations.

Doppler's principle, especially when applied to light, has been attacked by not a few, yet it seems to stand the test. It is true that Doppler's attempt to account for the variation of color in changeable stars on his principle, by supposing them to move towards or recede from us is inexact; for as there exist obscure rays beyond the red and violet, these colors on a change in the ether waves would assume those shades which would have disappeared for the red and violet respectively, so that the general color would remain unchanged.

But although this circumstance precludes the application of Doppler's principle where there is question of the total color of the star, still this cannot be said with regard to the change of position in the absorbing lines. The rapid motion of a star changes, in fact, the position of all the dark lines observed in its spectrum. For this motion rendering all the ether waves of the rays emitted from the star longer or shorter, modifies in the same way the waves of the absorbed light. It happens, therefore, that the dark lines are shifted towards the violet or towards the red according as the motion is forward or backward. Their intensity, however, remains the same. As to the verification of the principle in its relation to light, we may mention that it has been applied to the motion of the planets which approach the earth and recede from it at well-known rates. Besides, Fr. Secchi, Professor Langley, and others have applied it to the sun, one limb of which is approaching us and the other receding from us as it revolves on its axis. In both instances the displacement calculated, though small, subsequent observations verified.

Before examining the application of this principle to solar phenomena as made in the new method, let us return for a moment to the widening of the lines above-mentioned, and see how this phenomenon when resulting from the temperature is explained by the supporters of the theory of thermodynamics. According to modern views the most minute particles of gas are subject to a rapid to and fro motion, which increases with the temperature. The tem-

perature being high, each particle of the violently agitated gas produces a spectrum line, either bright by radiation, or obscure by absorption. Now the line actually observed being a resultant of all these elementary lines, which are shifted some one way some another, is wider than when the temperature is lower, for the shifting is then less. And when the lines increase in width the edges appear not so well defined as the middle portion. This explanation coupled with the fact that a denser gas must produce wider lines, satisfactorily accounts for the phenomenon of the increase in width. We may remark that the darkening of the lines arises from increase in pressure and thickness, while their ill-defined appearance is due to temperature.

Lockyer, accepting Doppler's principle as true when applied to the shifting of the lines in the spectra of rapidly moving gases, has measured the velocity of gaseous eruptions on the sun's surface. The gaseous masses thus raised have not only a rapid upward motion, but once raised they move like gigantic cyclones in the solar atmosphere. Both these motions, the upward and the lateral, similar to that of our winds, can be measured by Lockyer's method. The first by observing the spectrum of a spot whilst in the middle of the solar disk, the latter by observing that of a prominence near the sun's limb. If we observe a spot when in the middle of the disk, any upward motion is a motion towards us along the visual ray; we can, therefore, measure the velocity of gases in their motion by examining the shifting of the lines in the spectrum of a spot thus located. So in the same manner by observing the shifting of the lines produced by a prominence near the sun's limb, we can ascertain the motion of the gases producing it in the direction of the visual ray, which being tangent to the sun represents the lateral motion of the gases, like that of a cyclone in our atmosphere. By this method it has been found that the hydrogen in the sun has sometimes the wondrous velocity of several hundred miles a second.

Though these deductions met with some contradiction on their first announcement, eventually they have been fully indorsed by the most eminent astronomers, among whom may be mentioned Secchi, Huggins, Young, Respighi, Rayet, Ferrari, etc.

From the preceding, and from other features in the new method of spectroscopic observation—features which are here omitted either because too technical or not bearing directly on our subject—it has been deduced that the nucleus of the sun (regarding which nothing certain is known) is surrounded first, by a very luminous layer, termed the photosphere, which, from all indications, is quite thick and exceedingly mobile. A second, called the reversing or absorbing layer, subtending about two seconds of an arc, equal to about one thousand miles in thickness, incloses the

first. This second layer, which appears bright during eclipses, gives the Fraunhofer lines, which at times are observed to be enlarged towards the sun's limb. Outside the second layer, and apparently five times as thick, is the chromosphere layer, which is mainly composed of hydrogen and an unknown substance, by many termed helium, giving a line near that of sodium. Above the chromosphere is the coronal atmosphere, the principal constituents of which are hydrogen, and a second unknown substance giving the green line 1474 on Kirchoff's map. During late eclipses, particularly that of 1878, phenomena were observed which lead to the conviction that this gaseous atmosphere is surrounded by minute meteoric bodies, sometimes called meteoric dust, whose presence explains the coronal light surrounding the sun when obscured by the lunar disk. Whatever may be the nature of this last appendix of the sun, which some connect with the zodiacal light, it is certain that the layers surrounding the photosphere form a kind of grating which lessens in a measure the intensity of its light; and when somewhat thinned, either by the uprisings of the photosphere or by other causes, they give rise to the *faculae*, or luminous points seen on the sun's surface, just as interior eruptions of gas by thickening this layer produce the spots by their absorption, as above-mentioned.

The consideration of solar spectroscopic observations having taught us to interpret the language of the stars, we can return to the solution of the questions proposed in the beginning, and frequently alluded to in the preceding pages concerning stellar spectra. We shall begin our explanation from the second stellar type, because the appearance of this type being altogether similar to that of our sun, nothing further need be added regarding these stars, as the temperature and pressure of their gases must be about the same as for the sun.

In the first type considerable variety is noted. We remarked that the stars of this group, when examined with the spectroscope, present a spectrum bearing large ill-defined lines of hydrogen absorption, while but few metallic lines make their appearance; therefore their gaseous atmosphere must be subject to a higher temperature and a greater pressure than in the second group. Their absorbing metallic lines are also fewer, and often not easily detected, a phenomenon which Fr. Secchi attributed to the dense atmosphere through which the lines are seen. If we should admit, for the moment, Lockyer's late theory regarding the so-called chemical elements as founded on fact, the increase in the width of the lines should be explained by the high temperature of the gases surrounding the stars of the first group,—a temperature capable of decomposing the metals, which, according to him, are reduced



to simpler substances, especially to hydrogen. But, whatever be said on this point, it is evident that there exists no marked difference between the stars of the first and second groups. They gradually pass from one into the other.

A similar gradation or connecting link is noted between the other two groups. The stars of these third and fourth types give indications of a comparatively lower temperature than that to which those of the first and second types are subject, the temperature decreasing from the first to the fourth. The spectra of the third and fourth groups of stars are comparable, as stated above, to that of nitrogen; that is, they are fluted. This appearance, according to the recent researches of Frankland, Lockyer, and others, seems to be owing to the presence of compound bodies not raised to a high temperature. If, in fact, the electric spark be passed through a compound body without raising the temperature sufficiently to decompose it, the spectrum produced will be composed of fluted spaces or band lines. In this respect nitrogen behaves like a compound body. If the temperature increase while the spark is passing, then, at the moment of decomposition, the spectrum changes, and, as a rule, the spectrum of the metal present becomes predominant. This being the case, it may be asked what compounds give spectra resembling the spectra produced by the stars of the third and fourth types? Fr. Secchi found—and so far as we know at the present writing the result of his experiments has not been denied—that the spectrum of benzine, or, in general, of the carbon compounds, is similar to those given by these stars. It is next to impossible, however, to define which of the carbon spectra in particular corresponds to each star, as the appearances of the carbon spectra vary considerably under different circumstances. The main difference, however, between the spectra of the third and fourth types seems to be that those of the fourth are bright band spectra, while those of the third contain absorption lines. Admitting this distinction, we can regard the third type as made up of stars whose brilliant portion—the photosphere—is surrounded by compound bodies which, absorbing a portion of the stellar light, produce fluted spectra. These compound bodies could not be present were the temperature as high as it is in the stars of the first and second groups. The spectra of the fourth group show that the light of these stars arises principally from the radiation of compound gases, whose temperature, therefore, must be lower still than that of the preceding type.

The following is a brief explanation of these stellar types as given by Fr. Secchi: "The stellar spectra of the first and second types produce lines of metallic absorption like those of our sun. The spectra of the third and fourth types give, besides the metallic lines, others corresponding to gases, very probably to carbon

oxide, or some other carbon compounds, and therefore these stars must be subject to a lower temperature than that of the first two types."

We would arrive at the same conclusion in admitting Lockyer's opinion regarding chemical elements, because in this view compound bodies, when the temperature is raised, are decomposed into their constituent elements, and these, at high temperatures, would all be reduced to hydrogen or to a few elements. In this opinion the stars of the first group, since they are the hottest, are composed mainly of hydrogen. The sun and other stars of the second type are at a temperature at which metals exist, but not their compounds, these latter being found only in the cooler stars.

To conceive some definite idea of the temperature of the stars, let us remark, with Fr. Secchi, that compound bodies, such as calcium oxide, can exist even at the temperature at which platinum melts, since the lines of this oxide are observed in the lime crucibles employed for the fusion of platinum. Now, in the sun and in some of the stars, calcium exists in the metallic state, consequently the temperature of these bodies is higher than the melting-point of platinum, the most infusible of metals.

We cannot, therefore, help admiring the exactness of Newton's remarks, who, long before science had reached the results which we have indicated, spoke thus in his eleventh query regarding the stars: "Are not the sun and fixed stars great earths, vehemently hot, whose heat is conserved by the greatness of the bodies, and the mutual action and reaction between them, and the light which they emit, and whose parts are kept from fuming away, not only by their fixity, but also by the vast weight and density of the atmospheres incumbent upon them, and very strongly compressing them, and condensing the vapors and exhalations which arise from them?"

To render somewhat complete this brief sketch of what the spectroscope has revealed regarding the condition of the stars, we shall touch upon a few other points alluded to in the beginning. We stated that ordinary methods of observation had shown that many of the so-called fixed stars, perhaps all, have an angular displacement. This, however, does not represent the total stellar motion, for the entire motion can be regarded as twofold; one in the direction of the visual ray, to which the second is perpendicular. This second is given by the displacement above mentioned, not in absolute length, but in an arc of a circle, whose dimensions are unknown, because the distance of the stars is unknown. But spectroscopic observations on the Fraunhofer lines, as explained hitherto, give the true value of the first motion. This method, which Huggins and Secchi first applied to the stars, gives only the relative

velocity of the earth and of the star under examination. But from this we can pass to the relative velocity of the star and of the sun by making the necessary correction for the motion of the earth in its orbit. By this method, which meets with many difficulties in its practical application, Huggins has shown that *Sirius* and *Regulus* recede from the sun with a velocity of about twenty miles a second; that *Rigel's* and *Castor's* rate is nearly twelve; and that all the stars of the Great Bear, except  $\alpha$ , also recede; while, on the other hand, this star and *Arcturus* approach at the rate of nearly forty miles per second; and *Vega*,  $\alpha$  *Cygni*,  $\alpha$  *Pegasi*, etc., also approach.

Fox Talbot has suggested the application of this method of discovering the velocity of the stars by the shifting of the lines in their spectra to some physical systems of double stars, with the view of determining their distance from us; at least when they have one common absorbing constituent in their atmospheres. If we observe a double star, the plane of whose relative orbit passes through or near the earth, and if by ordinary astronomical observations we can determine the points at which the tangents to the orbit of one star revolving around the other are parallel to the visual ray, then measuring the relative velocity of the two stars (which is the actual velocity at which one rotates around the other), we can calculate the dimensions of the orbit described, and having observed the angle subtended by it, we can deduce the distance of the double star from our own planet. The process is exact, but the difficulties to be encountered are appalling.

The spectroscope, furthermore, has solved a problem presented by some double stars, which for a long time somewhat puzzled astronomers. Many double stars when examined with the telescope were found to exhibit complementary colors. It was doubted whether these colors were real or due to an optical illusion. Now, on examining these stars with the spectroscope it was found that in some cases one star presented a spectrum in which there was absorption of one color, while the complementary of that color was absorbed in the spectrum of the second star. In other cases, one star has appeared nearly white, while in the other the blue and green were almost entirely cut off by absorption. Hence these last stars are, the one white, the other red; but by an optical effect of contrast one appears green, the other quite red, while in the first case the complementary color is the real color of the star.

Let us, in conclusion, make a few remarks pertaining to spectroscopic observations on the variable stars, both periodical and temporary. The most remarkable periodically variable star is *o Ceti*, also called *Mira*, whose period is 331 days, 8 hours. For about five months it is invisible to the naked eye; then in three months it reaches the brightness of a star of the second magnitude,

and afterwards gradually disappears. Examined by the spectroscope at its maximum brightness it is yellow, and can be classed among the stars of the third type; during its decline it becomes reddish, and preserves only a few very fine and quite faint lines. Two temporary stars have been discovered since the invention of the spectroscope, one in 1866 in the constellation of *Corona Borealis*, the other in 1876 in *Cygnus*.

Before the application of the spectroscope to the stars, they were examined simply to note their change in luminous intensity and color, only vague hypotheses being advanced to account for the variations. The spectroscope enables us to distinguish three classes. In some the variations, which are generally of short duration, are caused by the periodical occultation of opaque bodies; thus Algol, which appears very bright for two days, diminishes in intensity to the minimum in three hours, and, remaining at this point for seven or eight minutes, it again brightens up in three hours. Now during all these changes its spectrum varies only in intensity, remaining unchanged in character. Hence the variation seems to be due to meteoric clouds, which move with a uniform motion, and when interposed between us and the star diminish its intensity. In others, again, the variation arises either from the rotation of the star itself, thus presenting different sides differently illuminated, or from a periodical emission of interior vapors, which produce a phenomenon similar to the solar spots. From unknown causes, referred by many to electricity, the sun's activity is variable. The interior eruptions of vapors, which are seen under the form of protuberances, and which produce by their absorption the solar spots, reach a maximum every eleven and a half years. Now as the phenomena remarked in some temporary stars, *Mira* for instance, are similar to the solar spots, only more marked, they are attributed to a like cause. In the third class the periods are irregular and unknown, the variation being due to immense fires, whose cause is unaccounted for, though attributed by some to the shock of planets or comets impinging upon them. The spectroscope, in fact, discovers bright lines in the spectra of some temporary variable stars, which are indicative of sudden and extensive conflagrations. Huggins has found the temporary star discovered in 1866 to contain mostly burning hydrogen; while in that discovered in 1878 Cornu found magnesium, sodium, or helium.

The foregoing sketch of the work accomplished by the spectroscope, though quite incomplete, comprises the main points which it has revealed regarding the stars; we say regarding the stars, for it has made known many other facts more or less connected with the present subject, which brevity obliges us to omit. Thus it has rendered more evident that the scintillation of the stars is

a phenomenon of terrestrial origin, depending on the motion of our atmosphere. It has shown that some of the nebulæ, contrary to previous opinions, cannot be resolved into separate stars, as has been done for many; for their spectra having bright lines are indicative of glowing gases. It has revealed various new facts pertaining to comets, meteorites, etc. So that glancing back over what has been achieved by this small instrument, we are simply astounded at the progress made; and this progress will doubtless open up facts hitherto hidden, not only in stellar physics, but in other branches of science.

---

### THE MORMONS.

**M**Y rambles in the Rocky Mountains commenced in the year 1860, when, after a trip of about two months and a half across the plains, I was stationed at Camp Floyd, Utah, and there made my first acquaintance with Mormonism. The post was the one established by General A. S. Johnson when he entered the Territory in 1858, and was situated about forty-five miles south of Great Salt Lake City, in a flat sage-bush plain, with very few Mormon settlers in the immediate vicinity. Numbers of them, however, used to come to the post with vegetables and other articles to sell, and in an emergency once I had occasion to employ as a nurse in my family a Mrs. W., a most estimable woman, wife, and mother, whose excellent qualities and kind services will long be remembered. Of course the "peculiar institution" of the Mormon people was frequently touched upon in conversation, and it was remarkable with what tenacity the doctrine of polygamy was defended, and sometimes by even the women themselves. This, however, is not by any means universal, and good Mrs. W. did not hesitate to express herself against the doctrine, at the same time that she entertained the fear that W. (her husband) might be "counselled" to give another "mother" to her children, in which event she did not know what he would do. With the men I frequently discoursed, interlarding bargains for potatoes and turnips with theological discussions, and the price of vegetables was not unfrequently intermingled with the price of sins in the next world, quotations from Scripture, and the "prophecies" of *Joe Smith*. Many of them exhibited considerable knowledge of the Bible, and one honest fellow did not hesitate to quote it as authority for

the modern practice of polygamy, saying that the patriarchs of old, "the chosen of the Lord," were notoriously polygamists, and that the modern people of the Lord (the Latter Day Saints) were but doing what had been plainly sanctioned by the Almighty. It was in vain to plead a less barbarous age and a later dispensation. The Mormon disputant rather demurred to the idea of any advance in civilization, and claimed a later revelation still through Joseph Smith and Brigham Young. As they always implicitly relied upon this latest revelation to the "Lord's chosen people," I soon found that as no premises could be agreed upon the resultant logic did not amount to much, and all argument ended, as it but too frequently does on such subjects, by leaving the disputants more firmly fixed than ever in their original convictions.

But we were soon called upon to enter into transactions more important than the discussion of theological questions, or the status of the Latter Day Saints; for the news reached us by "pony express" of the fall of Fort Sumter and the commencement of the civil war. We waited with impatience for the arrival of the order recalling our garrison to the East to participate in the defence of an imperilled country. The long-expected and anxiously anticipated order did not reach us till late in the spring, having gone by mistake to California, and it was not until the 27th of July that the troops moved out in a long dusty column from the partially dismantled post on their twelve hundred miles march to the eastward. A large quantity of stores of all kinds had been accumulated at the post, and it became a matter of some importance to determine what disposition should be made of them, for many of the stores consisted of arms and ammunition, and as nearly all the public transportation had been sold by orders from the late Secretary (Floyd) these could not be transported East. To send them by contract freight would cost more than they were worth, even were there any certainty that they would reach their destination. The policy of permitting them to fall into the hands of the Mormons was questionable; for they had been brought into the country by an army sent to compel these people to acknowledge the authority of the Government, and now that the Government was threatened with a more formidable rebellion there was no attempt on the part of the Mormons to conceal their satisfaction, and no lack of "prophecies" on the part of their leaders, that the day of Mormon vengeance was come, and the doom of the unjust Government of the United States sounded. To turn these military supplies over to them therefore was to place arms in the hands of probable enemies. It was, therefore, decided to destroy the arms and ammunition, and hundreds of excellent rifles and millions of cartridges were ruthlessly committed to the

flames, much to the disgust of the Mormons, who made no concealment of their dissatisfaction. Threats came to our ears that we would not be permitted to leave the Territory without attempts being made to steal our animals, and as the Mormons were known to be adroit horse thieves, great precautions were taken during the first part of the march to prevent this threat from being carried out. A remarkable case had occurred when some troops left the Territory the year before, which will serve to demonstrate the necessity for these precautions. One of the officers owned a fast mare which had beaten in all the races which she had run, and her possession was coveted by the racing fraternity in the Territory. The owner was warned when he left Camp Floyd to keep a sharp eye on his mare. He took the precaution to provide a metal collar and chain fastened with a padlock, and one night in the cañon of the Timpañogos she was locked to a tree near the owner's tent, and placed under charge of a sentinel. The next morning she was missing and was never again seen by the owner.

As indicating the moral tone existing in the community I cannot do better than give an account of the subsequent history of this animal. The owner wrote back an account of his loss to one of the officers at Camp Floyd, and transferred his ownership to him if he could recover the mare. Inquiries were at once made through a *Gentile* merchant of Salt Lake City, Mr. D., who, on communicating with the celebrated *Danite* "Bill Hickman," soon found out where the mare was. Hickman was a notorious character, whose reputation as a horse thief and murderer was well known throughout the Territory. He was a member of a band in Utah known as "Danites," or the "avenging angels of the Lord," to whom was committed, according to popular rumor, all the bloody work of the Mormon priesthood. He communicated to Mr. D. with a great deal of apparent zeal the fact that he had discovered that the mare was in the possession of a band of horse thieves, and *thought* he could recover her, but it might cost some money. He was told to make the effort, and shortly afterwards reported that he had succeeded in getting possession of her after a great amount of risk and at considerable expense, the agent he had commissioned to *steal* her having been detected in the first attempt and threatened with death by the band if he renewed the effort; but he did renew it and succeeded, and the mare was now in Bill Hickman's possession. Of course every one will say she was at once turned over to the rightful owner; but justice was not quite so quickly administered in Utah, and when Mr. D. proposed to pay Bill Hickman for his trouble the latter brought in such a complicated and heavy bill of expenses as to foot up a good deal more than the intrinsic value of the animal, and it then became evident that the

whole matter was a trick, and it was more than suspected that Bill Hickman had held possession of the mare from the first, and was in fact either personally or by means of one of his gang the *original* thief. In any ordinary community the process for recovering the stolen property would have been very simple; but the Mormons were not an ordinary community, and there were complications about this case on which it would be unjust to Mr. Hickman to suppose he did not place a full value. Mr. D., the merchant through whom the negotiations took place, was a *Gentile*, that is, he was *not* a Mormon, and he contemplated converting all his available property into cattle and driving them the following spring to California for a market. Now a cattle merchant in that country is very much at the mercy of any enterprising individual quick in the use of a revolver and unscrupulous enough to use it over the vast waste which extends from the settlements of Utah to those of California; and, as Mr. Hickman told Mr. D. very plainly that he looked to *him* for the settlement of his "little bill," the latter knew very well that if any steps, legal or otherwise, were taken to recover the fast mare Mr. Bill Hickman's "pound of flesh" with compound interest would come out of his cattle the next spring on their way to California! He had therefore nothing to do but to report to the officer at Camp Floyd the condition of affairs, the price at which he could buy back his own property from the thief, and to beg him to take no other steps for its recovery, as in that event Mr. D.'s whole fortune would undoubtedly be sacrificed. Of course the owner of the mare declined to pay the exorbitant price, and Bill Hickman remained in quiet possession of the fastest racehorse in Utah!

The facts in the case came to my knowledge after my arrival at Camp Floyd, and when, shortly afterwards, the officer alluded to left the post he transferred his title to me, provided I could recover the animal without in any manner compromising Mr. D. Some time afterwards Bill Hickman paid a visit to Camp Floyd in company with a United States District Judge of the Territory, and I sought a personal interview with him, with the idea that under the shadow of judicial authority I could bring influences to bear which would induce him to give up the property. I have often laughed over the result of the interview and the keen business cunning displayed by Bill Hickman. With an air of the most perfect frankness he admitted that he had not the slightest title to the mare, and then went over the long story which I already knew in regard to the trouble and expense he had gone to in getting possession of her; how, with a mare and a colt, a pair of oxen, a cow and a calf, and I don't know what amount of money, he had bribed a man at the risk of his life to steal her; and that all he wanted of Mr. D. was to do what was fair, ending with, "and I know from your face, '*Cap*,' that *you*



would not ask anything else." This delicate compliment coming from one I had every reason to look upon as an unprincipled horse thief and murderer failed as an appeal to my principles of justice, and I tried to scare the man by referring to a legal process and the United States judge then on the ground. The result reminded me of the answer given by a Western hunter, who was asked on one occasion by what is called in the Western country "a Pilgrim" to ride out and *drive in* a bear, so that he, the Pilgrim, could get a shot at him, "Perhaps he won't drive worth a cent!" Bill did not scare "worth a cent," and the interview terminated very unsatisfactorily to me.

Determined, however, to leave no stone unturned to accomplish my purpose, I wrote a note to Mr. Hickman, asking him to send me an order for the mare, as it would "prevent trouble to all parties," hoping that this cloudy threat would have the desired effect. And it did, for in answer he sent me a very badly spelled and illy written note, in which he protested that all he wanted was "what was fair and square," and inclosed me, not *one*, but *two* orders for the property in dispute.

Now the reader will say "that *was* 'fair and square,' and now you will certainly get your property." But before jumping to this conclusion he must scan the orders, as I did. One of these was found to be an order for the mare in my favor *on Mr. D.*; the other was in favor *of Mr. D.* on Bill Hickman's brother-in-law, who had the mare in charge, so that to get possession I still had to work *through* Mr. D., whose property would inevitably be sacrificed by Bill Hickman and his band to get the full price of the stolen animal!

After this display of diplomatic acuteness I gave up in despair, and was obliged to acknowledge that in driving a bargain I could not compete with the sharp practice of a Mormon horse thief.

Another incident which occurred just as we were leaving Camp Floyd will serve to illustrate the temper of the people we were among. A few days before our departure a bugler in my battery deserted, taking my private horse with him. Our deserters were always cordially received and freely harbored by the Mormons, and if they brought any stolen property with them so much the better; for all such was looked upon as spoils from the Philistines.

I obtained information that the deserter had gone south and was supposed to be at the town of Springville, south of Lake Utah, in company with other deserters who had concentrated there. I therefore asked Colonel Cooke to send, the day we commenced the march, an officer with a party around by the south end of the lake to attempt to capture the renegades. This was done, and the party regained us at the mouth of the Timpañogos Cañon two days after-

wards, with my horse, which was captured. As the party approached Springville one of them, a corporal belonging to my battery, rode ahead, and representing himself as a deserter, easily obtained information from the Mormons where the deserters were located. He found several of them in a house, was gladly received, and told where to conceal his horse—in a large cornfield close by. He repaired to the place and pretended to prepare to leave his horse, but was startled by the sudden ringing of the church bells of the town. All the deserters immediately broke for the cornfield, and the corporal taking his own horse and leading mine, which he found amongst those concealed, joined his party. The ringing of the bells had undoubtedly been a prearranged signal between the Mormons and the deserters, and had the appearance of the main party been delayed for a short time all the deserters would probably have been captured. As it was they all escaped.

Under such circumstances we, of course, took every precaution against treachery; for, although the Mormon leaders were neither rash enough nor impolitic enough to attack us openly, there was no questioning they had the disposition to cripple us, and they would have effectually done so had they succeeded in running off our stock. We travelled and camped, therefore, with every precaution, and I did not go to bed a single night until we camped in the Narrow Echo Cañon, beyond which the danger was comparatively slight.

The day we passed through the cañon will long be remembered; for, as a party of officers rode along, the "pony express" was seen coming behind us from the direction of Salt Lake. The rider pulled up long enough to hand a printed slip to one of our number, and immediately started off again on a full run with his budget of news to the eastward.

We eagerly gathered around to hear the news read from the slip. It was the first telegraphic dispatch of the battle of Bull Run, fought ten days before. The information in that time had been telegraphed to Fort Kearney, which was then the western terminus of the line. From there it had been taken by "pony express" to Salt Lake City. There it was eagerly printed by the Mormon press on slips, and one of these the return "pony" had placed in our hands. The dispatch commenced by stating McDowell's preliminary movements, and went on to say that his troops carried everything before them, driving the rebel army, and we were all exulting over the result when the reader read off the last paragraph, by which we learned that our troops were seized with an unaccountable panic and had retreated in a disorderly mob on Washington. The sudden fall in the dispatch from a complete victory to a disastrous defeat was depressing in the extreme, and

such men as Buford (then a captain), who gave his life to the country two years afterwards, after reaching a higher grade in the service; Sanders (then a lieutenant and a Mississippian), who fell at Knoxville, gallantly fighting for the Union, as a general officer; and Merritt (also a lieutenant), who gained such reputation as a cavalry general in the war, gloomily discussed the question whether or not when we reached the end of our long seventy days' march we should find our Government in existence. Long and tedious days followed before we gained any further news, and what we did pick up from the trains of emigrating Mormons along the road was anything but encouraging. These new converts to Mormonism seemed to be fully impressed with the Utah spirit of hostility to the Government, and we were all grimly amused at the retort of a little Mormon urchin, who was driving a cow along with one of the trains, and with whom one of the officers attempted to joke about Mormonism and Brigham Young. "Look out for yourselves," he replied; "*Beauregard* is waiting for you down the road!"

We reached Fort Leavenworth on the 8th of October, however, without interruption either from the Mormons or the representatives of *Beauregard's* cause, who, according to the rumors we heard as we neared the eastern terminus of our march, were to attack us by an expedition from the State of Missouri.

Thus terminated for a time my rambles in the Rocky Mountains and my studies of Mormonism. The former were resumed after the war, in 1867, and the latter two years later, in 1869, when I took command at Camp Douglas, a post about three miles from the centre of the city, and situated on a bench overlooking and commanding the whole place.

No one could fail to be impressed with the change which eight years had wrought in the surrounding circumstances. The Pacific Railroad had been completed, and the distance from the Missouri River to the Valley of Salt Lake, which in 1861 required a long and toilsome march of two months and a half, was now passed over in *as many days* comfortably and pleasantly, in a luxurious Pullman car, with a telegraph line along the track to provide for all contingencies.

The spirit of Mormonism, however, was unchanged, and although the easy access to the outside world was already beginning to produce its effect, the Mormons formed practically a closed community, entirely separated in feeling and principle from the rest of mankind, looking with jealousy towards any increase of population, except from its own peculiar natural causes and its own emigrants from abroad.

Camp Douglas was established during the war by volunteers from California, against the earnest protest of the Mormon leaders,

who went so far even as to threaten active resistance. The troops were fortunately under the command of one who possessed the requisite firmness to disregard these threats, and General O'Connor firmly established himself in the position which at once became the rallying-point for disaffected Mormons and others who felt more secure under the shadow of the United States flag than within the Mormon community, where "apostates from the faith," as they were called, or obnoxious "Gentiles" were not safe from the knife of the secret assassin. A number of these murders had occurred within a comparatively recent period, and the Mormon leaders, especially Brigham Young, were openly charged with inciting or directly "counselling" them. Whether this charge was correct or not the fact remains that in no one single instance that I can recall was one of these murderers brought to justice and punished, so that unprejudiced minds will hold the community at large responsible for these crimes, even if proof be lacking to convict the leaders of directly or indirectly ordering their commission.

In this way the post of Camp Douglas became a sharp thorn in the side of the Mormon leaders. "Apostates" resorted to the post and were safe from Mormon persecution, and the dead of the "Gentiles" were deposited in their little cemetery, where a monument to the memory of Dr. Robinson, foully murdered when called from his house in the darkness of night on the pretence of ministering to a suffering patient, still calls for vengeance on his murderers. The position occupied by the post in 1869 is aptly described by Lieutenant-General Sheridan during a visit there in the summer of that year. He speaks of it as occupying the position of a consulate in a foreign country. It constituted the "city of refuge" of the country, within the limits of which all who flew from "the wrath of the church" were secure for the time being.

The post itself occupies a position some six or seven hundred feet above the city, and is situated on what is called a "bench," a nearly level shelf of land, several of which extend around the Valley of Salt Lake, plainly marking the former borders of the lake when the waters were at higher levels. It is directly in front of a cañon, out of which flows a fine stream of water, which, by means of trenches, is conducted through the post, and afterwards serves to irrigate the lands of the valley below. Behind it to the eastward rise the mountains of the Wahsatch range, which farther to the south tower up into prominent peaks, inclosing the Big and Little Cottonwoods and other cañons, at a later day to be filled with an enterprising mining population in search of the precious metals. In front the broad open Valley of Salt Lake extends like a vast map directly beneath the eye, and bordered by peaks which, during all but the warmer months, are capped with snow. At one point

in the northwest the beautiful lake stretched off to the *horizon*, where, with headlands upon each side, it presents the appearance of a sea-view from a land-locked harbor, making it easy to fancy oneself upon the seacoast instead of in the centre of a great continent. Through the centre of the valley runs the River *Jordan*, connecting Lake Utah with the Great Salt Lake, and the low ground near its mouth is broken up with various lakes and little patches of water, which as the sun sinks in the west become visible by the reflected light. But few more beautiful views can be found than is presented to a beholder at Camp Douglas when, late in the afternoon of a summer or fall day, he looks towards the setting sun as it dips behind the distant mountains. The reflected rays light up and bring to view various patches of water before unseen in the unbroken waste, which variegate the landscape; and, as the sun sinks behind an apparent ocean-horizon, they light up the whole scene with a peculiar roseate tint, which seems to be the effect of the salt in the water, as I have witnessed like effects at salt lakes in Texas.

The waters of Salt Lake form a saturated solution, in which it is almost impossible for a bather to sink. In it the human form floats without motion of hand or foot, like a cork, and although three considerable streams, the Jordan, the Weber, and Bear rivers, pour their fresh waters into it, the immense deposit of salt on the bottom keeps up the strength of the solution. Near the mouths of the streams the water, of course, varies from fresh to brackish, and fish are found in it; but in the body of the lake it was for some time supposed no living thing could exist. Examination, however, has disclosed the existence of a minute crablike insect, which is thrown upon the shore in vast numbers, and by decomposition produces a very decided odor. In the shallow water near the shore salt deposits of great thickness are found, and these, dug up and carried off in wagons, are, after purification, used for the usual purposes. The whole valley east of the lake and the River Jordan is fed by numerous streams of bright cold water, which, flowing down from the mountains, formerly meandered their way through a sage brush waste. By the use of these streams the industrious Mormons, by skilfully directed labor, have covered the bench lands and slopes with grain fields, fruit trees, and thriving villages. It is a curious sight to see a field of luxuriant wheat growing inside a rough fence, whilst outside is flourishing in the dry arid soil the sage brush in all its native wildness.

Most of these streams are stocked with an abundant supply of the most delicious brook trout, and these gave an incentive and a zest, which only an enthusiastic sportsman can appreciate, to many a ramble in the Rocky Mountains, during which I tramped over

ground since made valuable by the discovery of mineral deposits. I wandered amidst the most magnificent scenery, caught my trout, met the Mormon people, and varied the sport by angling with them on theological and philosophical questions. I never met with more kindly treatment as a general thing, and am free to confess that in all my intercourse with them they were as honest and conscientious in the expression of their opinions, so far as I could judge, as people of their class in society usually are. They were as ready, too, to snap at a theological bait thrown at them as the trout of their native streams at an attractive "fly."

A favorite place of resort was in Parley's Park, about twenty-five miles from Camp Douglas, where a house of entertainment was kept by a Mr. William Kimbal, a son of the Mormon prophet of that name, since dead. At my first visit we were cordially received, invited to fish in the stream which runs through his fields, and, having declined the proffered hospitalities of his house, were urged to pitch our tents in his grassy meadows. In the evening our camp-fire furnished a favorable location for a council ground, and around it we chatted with Mr. Kimbal, first about the fishing, then about the country, and gradually drifting into Mormonism. I found him very intelligent and frank, and his manner prompted me to ask him a plain question. I found that, whilst a pronounced Mormon, he professed as much pride in being a citizen of the United States as any one. I, therefore, said: "Mr. Kimbal, you profess to be a loyal citizen of the United States, do you not?"

"Certainly, I do."

"How then do you reconcile your position with the fact that you are living in open violation of the United States laws?" The question seemed to dumfound him for a moment. He looked his astonishment, and I continued:

"Are you not a practical Mormon and a polygamist?"

"Yes," he said, "I am; but I have *never married since the passage of the anti-polygamy law*, and am not violating the law, since by the Constitution Congress cannot enact any *ex-post facto* laws!"

This was a novel view of the subject, and although the doctrine was probably unsound it clearly demonstrated the fact that the law had set at least a portion of the Mormons to *thinking* and arguing out their position under the law. Mr. Kimbal was evidently earnest and conscientious, and not disposed to permit the Mormon priesthood to lead him into any *further* violations of the law. But his was only a single instance. Others did not exhibit such scruples, and still continued to openly violate the law at the dictation of Brigham Young and his "counsellors."

Such "counselling," as it was called, was generally accepted by the "saints" with the fullest faith in Brigham Young's authority

as a messenger from the Almighty. The idea was impressed upon his followers that the woman gains her exaltation in the next world through the man, and although I am not sufficiently well versed in the doctrine to say whether or not they went to the extreme of holding that all salvation was denied to spinsters, yet this much is certain, it was strongly impressed upon all that the wife shared in the "glory" of the husband, and that the exaltation of the latter, his seat and influence in the heavenly realms, depended upon the number of his seed—that is, upon the number and, it is presumed, the quality of his children. It is a fruitless speculation now to argue how it was possible for any man in this advanced age of civilization to impress upon his followers a doctrine so closely bordering upon the Mohammedan, regarding a subject upon which he could by no possibility *know anything*. The *fact* remains, and is a very strong proof of Brigham Young's influence with a people over whom, until quite recently, his simple word had the effect of law. It is a tribute to his intellect, which even his worst enemies cannot deny, that, whilst really ruling with despotic powers, he has succeeded in making his followers believe that they rule themselves. The spectacle presented to an outsider of a vast Mormon assemblage voting by raised hands on one of Brigham Young's propositions, "cut and dried" beforehand, is sufficiently amusing.

It may not be out of place, however, to make some comments as to how Brigham Young gained such an influence. One of the lower spurs of the Wahsatch range near his residence in Salt Lake is pointed out to strangers as the place where the Prophet was formerly in the habit of "going up to the Mount to commune with the Lord and pray," and, if only a part of what is told of him be true, it may account in a measure for his influence over a population in which the most marked characteristic is extreme ignorance, whilst it demonstrates that as a close observer of nature's workings he has few superiors. It is related that the first season after the advent of the Mormons into Salt Lake Valley the people were made desperate at seeing their growing crops ruthlessly destroyed by vast herds of black crickets. In the midst of "the murmuring of the people" against "the chastening of the Lord," and the prospect of starvation, Brigham Young counselled patience and reliance upon the Lord, who would not permit his "chosen people" to be destroyed, and *predicted* that in a few days vast swarms of birds would appear to destroy the pests of the grain-fields. And sure enough, so runs the legend, in a short time gulls, similar to the common sea-gull, numbers of which can be seen about the Lake, appeared in vast flocks and commenced their work on the crickets. It is related that this bird will gorge itself with the crickets, then

*disgorge* and go at its work again. Now whether this story is strictly true or not, it will serve to show the character of Brigham Young's influence over his people, and no one can fail to remark the Mosaic type of the legend. It reminds us, too, of the method by which the Seminole "medicine-man" got rid of his enemies. He made up little puppets and named them after certain parties whose influence in the tribe was becoming obnoxious to him. These he set up in "council" and shot at them with arrows. If the puppet was hit he predicted the early death of the individual represented, and if he did not hit the first time he took another shot! The obnoxious party was very sure soon after to die a sudden death, and the "medicine-man" was "a true prophet." Unless Brigham Young is a very much slandered man, he copied Sam Jones as well as Moses, depending in both cases for the impression made by the fulfilment of his prophecies on that element in human nature which so readily, in deluded people, assigns supernatural causes where natural ones can easily be discovered, either by close observation or the use of such material as the Mormon Prophet had at hand in his "Avenging Angels" or "Band of Danites."

Another favorite fishing resort was Cottonwood Cañon, where on our first visit we made the acquaintance of a Mr. B., who kept the tollgate over the Mormon road built up the cañon to a lake situated almost at the very top of the mountains, both stream and lake furnishing abundant sport. During a subsequent visit a rainstorm drove us for shelter into Mr. B.'s cabin, where we were hospitably entertained by his cheerful little wife, who never seemed to be without a pleasant word or song upon her lips. I had with me two favorite dogs, a setter and a pointer, neither of which would ever suffer the other to be caressed without poking his own nose under the hand to get his share. Mrs. B. at once won our good wishes by insisting the dogs should come in too, declared she was fond of dogs, and kindly patted Don on the head. Instantly Jackey's nose was pushed forward for recognition, and Mrs. B. broke into a ringing laugh, with the exclamation, "There's jealousy for you!" The quick recognition of the feeling led easily to the subject of polygamy, and I was induced to remark that doubtless she was Mr. B.'s *only* wife? a question which in any other portion of the civilized globe would have been regarded as the grossest of insults. "Indeed I am," she replied, "and likely to be the only one." B. and herself, she said, were of one mind upon that subject; she did not think he would ever care to have another wife, and she was very sure she would never desire it. But, oh, inconsistency of human nature! The moment I expressed strong opposition to the doctrine of polygamy she ruffled up, like a hen whose chicken



is attacked, and commenced to defend it, telling us how her father's *second* wife, when he went "on a mission," took charge of, fed, and clothed the children of his first wife (her mother) and many other things to show us (the unbelieving Gentiles) how advantageous it was sometimes for a man to have several wives. The "*church doctrine*" must be upheld though every noble prompting of the gentle heart rose up in arms against it, and the possibility of a personal application being thrust out of sight. B. was a small-sized man, and his wife ended the talk with the quaint remark that "what little there was of him she wanted herself," which was greeted with a hearty laugh of approbation, and we always renewed our acquaintance with Mrs. B. on our fishing trips with pleasure.

I have remarked that one of the characteristics of the Mormon population as a body is their extreme ignorance. This feature in the Mormon people has been taken advantage of by their leaders, many of whom are very far from being ignorant. They have skilfully directed such education as is given in the Territory to their own ends, and by a system of clerical instruction they are leading the minds of the rising generation, as they lead their irrigating ditches, to fructify only such seed as they themselves have planted. This is done by a system of schools, not only under charge of the leaders of "the church," but supplied with textbooks *prepared and printed* in the Territory, and it is doubtful if the same amount of ignorance can be found over the same extent of country in any civilized region of the world.

Once, whilst on a fishing excursion in the Valley of the Timpañog, a fine large stream, which empties into Lake Utah from the eastward, and on the bank of which is situated Heber City, quite a large flourishing town, my camp was visited by several boys, who, boy like, were ready to give us all the information we wanted in regard to the deepest and best trout-holes in the stream. We soon got into free conversation with them, and one of them, a boy of twelve or fourteen years of age, was asked if he knew who was President of the United States. His stolid look of ignorance showed that he was entirely "at sea," and I asked him if he knew "who General Grant was?" He had heard me addressed as "General," and replied, "No; not unless *you* are him!" When asked if he knew who governed the country he lived in, he frankly confessed he did not "unless it was Brother Brigham!" and when told that Brigham Young was not even a subordinate official, he received the information with a smile of incredulity, which said, as plainly as words could say it, that *he* knew better than that, and that we were a party of "ungodly Gentiles," trying to lead him astray. Is it any wonder that in a community so governed, where all instruction is given by

"the church," that all true education is at fault, and that ignorance should prevail.

Of course such a state of things cannot exist forever, and the march of civilization, as typified by railroads, telegraphs, a free press, and the influx of an outside population, will in time effect a change. Already have these begun to have their effect, but the human mind, like water, will not run up hill if left to itself. It has to be *pumped* up by machinery. That pumping process is now going forward in Utah.

Until the advent of the railroad into the Territory the Mormon people was a close corporation, in which men held property and even life itself at the mercy of the authorities of "the church." This is a fact notoriously denied by the leaders of "the church," but known to be true by every one who has had opportunity to make observations. Innumerable cases of cold-blooded murders of "Gentiles" obnoxious to "the church" are known to have occurred, and in not one single instance has the perpetrator been brought to punishment so far as I can recall.

The wholesale butchery, nineteen years ago, of the men, women, and children belonging to an emigrant train, so far from resulting in bringing to justice the perpetrators of it, was persistently attributed by the newspapers and leaders in "the church" to Indians, and for long years every obstacle was thrown in the way of any attempt to investigate the matter. Military and civil officers of the United States visited the scene of the massacre at Mountain Meadows soon after the occurrence, and obtained evidence which settled the question beyond a doubt that Mormons and Mormon leaders were the perpetrators of the foul outrage; and if the question as to whether or not the act was "counselled" by the highest authorities of "the church" is still an open one not yet settled by positive proof, their guilty knowledge is beyond dispute, and the damaging fact remains that for nineteen years not only has no attempt been made by the Mormon authorities to bring to justice the perpetrators of the foulest outrage ever committed in a country professing to be civilized, but every effort has been put forth to shield the guilty, and every obstacle thrown in the way of a judicial investigation. These efforts have been successful for nineteen long years, during which the blood of the innocent victims has been calling for vengeance in vain from one of the far-off recesses of the Rocky Mountains. But last year the principal leader of the band of murderers, a bishop in "the church," was brought before a jury of his *peers*, and—convicted? No, for a portion at least of his "peers" were Mormons like himself, and the jury declined to convict, as Mormon juries uniformly decline to convict, at the nod of "the church," which governs everything in this world and the next. But this

year another trial takes place, and as I write one of those pumping machines, the telegraph, which is forcing the Mormon mind to a higher level, flashes all over the land the intelligence that John D. Lee, the active leader of that murderous band nineteen years ago, has been convicted of the crime and sentenced to death, and, strange freak of all, a Mormon paper now speaks of the condemned criminal as the "arch fiend." Is this an evidence of a returning sense of justice and virtue, or a result of some occult trick in the policy of the head of "the church?" Time and further developments resulting from other trials to take place only can show. Inasmuch as so sudden a change to justice and virtue in the course of a single year is not probable, it is more than suspected that the conviction of Lee is due to church "counselling." This view of the case naturally brings us to the question as to how long a system like that of the Mormons can exist after the active mind which governs the whole is removed. If a ship at sea is entirely dependent upon a single man to guide her course, the removal of that one insures her destruction when tempests assail her. In despotisms men are governed *too much*. As they are not permitted to act except at the nod and beck of some particular person, all individuality is lost, and men cease even to think for themselves. When, therefore, the one person disappears, the many suffer and are literally "at sea" without a rudder when the storm comes, which it sooner or later does to all human institutions. A community governed by free institutions is comparatively free from such dangers, and no *one man* is an absolute necessity. In that case the community governs itself. Whether well or illy governed rests with itself, and if ordinary freedom and intelligence prevail the chances are that it will be well governed, and on such sound principles that the presence or absence of any particular individual will be of little account, however valuable for the time being, and the system of government will continue from one generation to the next like a well-regulated, smoothly-working machine.

All who have had an opportunity of observing the workings of government in Utah know that the Mormon community is not such a one as I have described. It is undeniable that the governing principle has resided until very recently in one man, and it is equally undeniable that in many things Brigham Young has governed well. His enemies say his government has been and is based entirely upon selfish principles. However this may be, the general results in many respects have been beneficial. The population as a class is industrious and thrifty, and by its labor has converted an immense extent of barren territory into blooming and productive fields, and this has been done frequently under the most disadvantageous and discouraging circumstances. The people too

are virtuous, as *they understand virtue*, and are generally honest, except when led astray by their leaders. To hear the "rank and file," taking their cue from their leaders, gravely asserting the superior virtue of the Mormon population over all the rest of mankind, would be amusing were it not so serious a matter, and had those who make the claim any experience whatever which would enable them to judge of what the remainder of the world regard as virtue. The virtues impressed upon the Mormon people by Brigham Young's overweening influence are of a peculiar nature, and in some respects not such as meet with indorsement from civilized mankind. That he has so impressed his peculiar ideas upon his people is an unquestionable proof, not only of his vast influence, but demonstrates that in point of intellect he is far above the average.

Since the death of Brigham Young, which occurred since this paper was written, no other man has since been "raised up," in Mormon phraseology, to fill his place, and it is more than doubtful if the Mormon exists who can *fill* it. For some time previous to his death, a report was current, which was probably well founded, that he was making strenuous efforts to so arrange matters in "the church" as to insure his mantle being bequeathed to one of his sons. But death's summons came suddenly, and before matters could be so arranged; and the church is now, I believe, governed by "The Council of Twelve," no one of whom has yet demonstrated that he possesses the intellect, nerve, tact, and unscrupulous character of the man who will go down in history as the great leader of the Mormon Church, Brigham Young.

---

## THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF RUSSIA.

THE present internal condition of Russia is attracting equal if not even greater interest than her external policy in the recent past excited. Reports from various sources, both numerous and trustworthy, disclose a state of things truly appalling, and one which takes not a few in this country, if not in Europe, outside of Russia, entirely by surprise. The causes of this surprise in the United States are to be found to a great extent in self-interest and in the influence of a venal press in systematically glossing over, if not entirely suppressing, facts which, if duly considered, would at least have moderated, if not dispelled, the extravagantly favorable opinion commonly entertained by the American public respecting the policy of the Russian Government, and the actual degree of progress in education and industrial pursuits of the Russian people. To this must be added the fact, which cannot be concealed, humiliating as it may be to acknowledge it, that the people of the United States are idolatrous worshippers of material power. With them success is a sure guarantee of popular approval, no matter what be the means by which that success is attained. The glamour of strength and power and inexhaustible resources, which were generally attributed to the Russian Government, blinded the eyes and deluded the judgment of the great majority of the people of the United States in regard to the real condition of Russia. Then there was another reason for prevailing delusions in regard to that country, which applies to Europe as well as to this country, though perhaps in less degree. We refer to the fact that it has been customary to include Russia in the family of civilized, enlightened nations. It is no wonder, therefore, that the public mind is startled by recent disclosures which seem to throw us back, when we consider the inward significance of the facts lately made public, into the ages of Asiatic despotism.

Until very recently the idea of political stability has been associated with Russia, and apparently not without good reasons. When the French Revolution burst forth a hundred years ago, the spirit that animated it overleaped the boundaries of France, and in the short space of fifty years, from 1789 to 1849, it caused almost every throne in Europe to tremble and totter. In the midst of the general apprehension and dismay Russia alone apparently remained unaffected by the disturbing causes. The Czar stood forth before us as the sole representative of stability. His dominions seemingly were beyond reach of the revolutionary cyclone which swept over all the rest of Europe. His person alone seemed invested with the unassailable, imperturbable majesty which is the traditional

characteristic of sovereignty. Whatever changes or convulsions disturbed or threatened the peace of other countries, Russia remained unchanged, undisturbed, quiet.

Nor is this all. The "Emperor of all the Russias" played with success the rôle of restorer of peace and order by aiding in pacifying or subduing popular uprisings in other countries. An instance directly in point is the assistance he rendered Austria in suppressing the rebellion of her Hungarian subjects. It was, therefore, quite natural that Russia, of all European powers, came to be considered as the *one* country above all danger of infection from revolutionary ideas. The events following 1848 did not weaken that prestige. The Crimean War, ended by the Treaty of Paris, had practically no other effect than to convince the governments of Europe that the Slav power of the North was one of gigantic dimensions; one whose ambitious schemes in the East could be neutralized only by a concerted action of Middle Europe; one, finally, which, at a future day, might endanger the balance of power by a Northern dictatorship. Then, again, many other considerations confirmed the belief that Russia had entered with a will upon what she conceived to be her mission; and that progress and civilization had acquired their full modern significance even in the realm of the Czar. Of these we enumerate the abolition of serfdom throughout the vast dominion of the Czar, the construction of a network of railroads, the expansion of commerce and trade, the conquest of Khokand, and the expeditions to Khiva. The campaigns of 1859, 1864, 1866, and the Franco-German War left Russia free to devote her undivided energies to the development of her immense resources. Thus she became *per fas vel nefas* the "Colossus of the North." No wonder, therefore, that when the outbreak of hostilities between Servia and the Porte signalized a new phase of the Eastern question, Europe concerned itself chiefly about the attitude which Russia would take.

It is not necessary to dwell here upon the series of events which began with the review of troops at Kischeneff, when the Czar bade them cross the Pruth, and ended, south of the Balkans, with the appearance of the Russian eagles before the walls of Constantinople. In spite of Osman Pasha's heroic defence of Plevna; in spite of the stubborn resistance offered in the Shipka Pass, Russia entered upon a career of success, victory following victory, until the Ottoman power lay crushed and exhausted at the mercy of the Czar, in Europe as well as in Asia. The Treaty of San Stefano, dropping the humanitarian pretext put forth at the beginning of the campaign, was an emphatic declaration in the face of Europe that Russia meant to supersede the rule of the Turks in Europe, and intended henceforth to act as "apostle of civilization" in the

Levant. Then came the memorable Congress at Berlin. The demands of Russia, it is true, were considerably curtailed by the diplomats assembled in the Palais Radzivil; but to the peace of Berlin has been applied what was said of the peace of Amiens, namely, that it was a treaty "about which every one was glad, but nobody proud." Despite large concessions—concessions that were compulsory—Russia nevertheless gained her end. For, Russian influence in the East is more potent to-day than it ever was before, and though the nominal dependency of the Sultan, namely, the suzerain principality of Bulgaria, has been made to embrace only the country north of the Balkan range of mountains, in direct opposition to Russian wishes, Bulgaria under Prince Battenburg, the grandnephew of the Czar, is *de facto* a Russian province, and the Southern frontier of Russia, though not reaching, as Russia at first demanded, to the Ægean Sea, is virtually advanced to the Balkan Mountains. It is true, therefore, that the fruits of victories won by Russian arms in the field of battle were somewhat lessened by defeats in diplomacy. But often a diplomatic defeat has the effect of a victory, and *vice versa*; and this is the case as regards Russia's position after the labors of the Congress at Berlin. The instrument there drawn up by the representatives of the great powers of Europe has neither checked Russian ascendancy in the East, nor has it prevented the Cabinet of St. Petersburg from converting the Porte from an enemy into an ally.

Allowing their due force to these considerations it would be entirely incorrect, it seems to us, to believe what has been asserted, namely, that the present discontent in Russia springs from the anger of the nation at finding that the immense sacrifices, made necessary by the late war, have brought no advantage to the empire. Nor can we share the opinion of those who ascribe the revolutionary outbursts in Russia solely to the mischievous workings of the Nihilists. Both views, the one which makes the war, and the other which makes the Nihilists, responsible for the disorder, are superficial. Both are dangerous illusions, and have resulted, we think, from a certain reluctance to resign long-held and apparently correct, but in reality incorrect, opinions respecting Russia. If we recall to mind that the disturbances began to show themselves in force long before the war was concluded, we will be forced to acknowledge that they cannot spring from dissatisfaction with the *result* of the war. The first view has, therefore, no actual basis of fact.

As to the second, it is not a handful of reckless miscreants which the government at St. Petersburg has to deal with, and endeavors to strike down. Were this the case, the social struggle in Russia would be divested of any deep meaning, and might be regarded as

simply a transitory disturbance. For, then, indeed, we might hold that "the force which a settled government can bring to bear upon Communists, Socialists, Nihilists, or by whatever names the conspirators against the social order are to be described, will succeed in repressing the ebullition." But, as a matter of fact, the social discontent is spread through all classes of the population and is found in every rank of society; and for this reason it seems to us impossible to regard the movement in Russia as only a Nihilistic rebellion.

The war, so Russians argued before its outbreak, might free the country from an arrogant and corrupt despotism; the war might precipitate the downfall of a system of government which had driven the nation to the brink of despair, because, in war, the weakness and the corruption of this system would probably become glaringly visible. Thus, we see, the war was partly the work, as it was also the main hope, of the revolutionists of 1877. Its immediate effect, in our judgment, has simply been to bring the already half-ripe elements of universal dissatisfaction to an early maturity.

Looked at in this light the exceptional condition in Russia acquires a different and a much graver meaning. The French revolution produced "reigns of terror," as we all know; and "reigns of terror" have in preceding ages, time and again, appeared sporadically. But of all those that we find recorded in history, there is none comparable with *that* reign of terror from which the realm of the Czar is now trembling. And, since the tendency to under-rate the seriousness of the complications in Russia is both widespread and deeprooted, it is, we hope, not amiss to cite a few facts, the consideration of which will dispel erroneous preconceptions.

Shortly after the appointment of General Gourko as military governor of the "government (district) of St. Petersburg," a decree was issued which placed the army under the surveillance of the police. Inasmuch as this measure by its very nature would necessarily tend to create indignation in the ranks of the army, its expediency may be questioned. The General himself, however, declares it a necessity, "because the army," he says, "is infested with discontent." The fact which directly led to it may serve as a case in point. General Gourko one day found a paper on his writing-desk, notifying him that the "Secret National Government" had passed sentence of death upon him. It so happened that only officers of the general staff and of the imperial guard had entered his house on that day, so that suspicion, of course, fastened upon them. The police, intrusted with the search of residences and persons, found, at last, compromising documents on one of the officers, and the result of this discovery was the publication of the decree just mentioned. So much as regards the army.



As to the number and social composition of the revolutionists we need only turn to official statements in the Russian press. Siberia, they say, is threatened with over-population. The colony of Semilashinsk received 3166 exiles within the months of January and February, 1879. Nine thousand arrested persons are on the road via Moscow to Siberia. No less than 58,000 have been transported there during the last three years.

The eleven prisons for the reception of convicts, namely, Irkoutsk, Tobolsk, Vilna, Perm, Pekow, Simbirsk, Iletskaia, Fastchita, Noroborissko, and Kharkoff, are so overcrowded that a regular service of deportation between Odessa and the island Saghalien has been established.

In Kieff ten prisoners were undergoing trial by court-martial in the early part of the month of April. Six of that number were females and only four males. Three of the latter were noblemen; and of the former, one was a lady of title and one the daughter of a privy councillor. Here is a fair specimen of the proportions in which sex and rank are mixed up among the conspirators, and it would be easy to multiply the instances. Suffice it to state, however, that the numbers as well as the rank of the revolutionists warrant the conclusion that Nihilism, pure and simple, could not have spread to such an extent as to produce the results before us. Additional to other reasons there is the fact that the Russian Government has certainly not been backward in resorting at once to measures of a sweeping character, and of the utmost severity against the Nihilists. Yet the situation is becoming graver and graver. From well-informed sources it appears that the revolutionists have adopted a new policy against the stern attitude of the government. This policy, we learn, consists chiefly in spreading terror and confusion in the large cities, and keeping the police incessantly on the "*qui-vive*." Herewith tallies the report of a proposed attack on the Winter Palace. It was a hoax, but so skilfully devised that the Grand Duke Nicholas remained for eight days with his suite in the building occupied by the general staff, and six or seven regiments were kept in readiness in their barracks, expecting an outbreak every moment. On another occasion, the "Third Section" received information that the blowing up of the gasometers was contemplated during the night, which proved another false alarm. Various corroborative accounts confirm, however, the belief that the revolutionists intended in all earnest to enact a "St. Bartholomew's night" in the capital on the 3d (15th) of June. The plan was frustrated by a timely discovery of it by the police, in consequence of which the authorities made most elaborate precautionary preparations. There seems to be no room to doubt but that these alone prevented the outbreak.

Now, all these facts have a meaning, and it is that the grievances of Russian society are not imaginary but real, grim, calamitous facts. Complaint is made that there is not one single section of the Russian world which does not revolt at the long-prevailing system of administrative corruption and grinding tyranny. The peasant class, it is maintained, suffers more than ever before. They are mercilessly pressed for arrears of taxes; they have been robbed of the lands which, as serfs, they cultivated for themselves under their former masters; they are plundered by those who have the management of their affairs; they are literally reduced to a state of wretchedness for which they find consolation only in drink.

The provincial police exercises more than ever an arbitrary and cruel power, and the peasantry after being beggared are thrown as a helpless proletariat on the world. They are forced in great numbers by compulsory drafts into the army, to be slaughtered on battlefields by the conspicuous inability of generals. In place of free institutions, which Russian society was led to expect at the beginning of the present reign, there is nothing but administrative tyranny and outrageous injustice. All individual rights and the rights of humanity are denied, and trampled upon with pitiless cruelty. The courts of justice are a mockery, the press is subservient to an odious government. Thousands have been imprisoned; the country has been drained of its money and of its resources. To this extreme of misery, malcontents declare, Russia has been brought during the present reign.

We are very far from giving implicit credence to all these statements. There is, doubtless, some exaggeration; but though exaggerated these utterances contain many grains of truth, and, therefore, we cannot afford to either disregard or dismiss them. If we readily concede that the stringency of the measures adopted by the Russian Government for the maintenance of order were justified, as is alleged, by the emergency, we ought to be no less ready to concede that the condition of the population which gave rise to this emergency must have been most deplorable. No doubt the arbitrary rule of the present *rigime militaire* of governors, invested with absolute power and responsible only to the Emperor, may convert many a peaceful subject of the crown into a secret foe by inflicting undeserved punishment upon the innocent. But we cannot give assent to a mode of reasoning which moves in a circle and explains the existence of seriously disturbed internal relations by the severity of certain measures of the Government, and then justifies this severity by pointing to those disturbed relations. Had not all classes of Russian society been suffering from arbitrary and irresponsible rule for generations; had they not borne a yoke heavier than that of slavery; had they not been driven to

despair, one and all ; had not this been the case—then, the efforts of all classes towards shaking off the old and securing a new and more equitable state of things, would be as unaccountable as the phenomenon that they show no discrimination in the selection of the means by which they hope to break their galling chains, a phenomenon peculiar to those only who are mad with despair. Without intense, extreme exasperation, the Russian world would not rush blindfold, as it were, into the arms of Nihilism.

And, indeed, we cannot realize the calamitous reign of terror as it unfortunately exists to-day in Russia, to its full extent, nor can we understand the nature of the social upheaval in that country, still less can we weigh the strength of the contending forces, if we do not extend our inquiry into the past. For the accumulation of an enormous autocratic power by the Czars on one side, and the successive and progressive deterioration of the condition of their subjects on the other, have gone on for many ages hand-in-hand. Russia entered the family of civilized nations at a late date. Before the time of Peter the Great the culture and civilization of Middle Europe had not reached the Slav tribes of the North. The history of the Ruriks, who died out in 1589, bears no resemblance to the history of those illustrious houses who reigned as their contemporaries. And when after a fifteen years' struggle Michael Romanow united, at last, the more important tribes under one sceptre, the realm then only entered on the period of consolidation. From 1613 to 1700 under the Romanoffs the nationality of Great Russia asserted simply its supremacy over the other Russian and Slavic tribes by conquest and subjugation, that is to say, always by force. During that whole period no perceptible advance was made towards civilization. The acceptance of Christianity (Greek-rite) had offered no difficulty to the deepseated religious feeling of the nation. The new era dawns for Russia with Peter. Rude, bold, and fearless, gifted with keen perception and unswerving tenacity of purpose, he proposed to make Russia's weight felt in the councils of Europe ; he proposed to add her to the "civilized" nations. The natural gradual development of the race in art, science, and letters had then hardly begun. Peter opened by force avenues for the ingress of civilizing influences ; and, eminently successful as he was, he left his country in a wonderful state of progression. Only a ruler of the giant energy of Peter could have accomplished what he did. He bestowed signal benefits upon the semi-barbarous nation ; but he also prepared the way for a future catastrophe by inaugurating absolutism. The consolidation of the Empire was a peremptory requisite to the success of his plans. But he went beyond what was necessary. He not only made Russia a power centring in the person, in the

will of the Czar, but he abolished the one power which he found to exist beside his own; namely, the power of the Church. Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century the Metropolitan of Moscow was the acknowledged head of the hierarchy of the Greek Church in Russia, and was practically independent of the Patriarch at Constantinople. The bishops, monks, and ruling elders, controlled by the Metropolitan at Moscow, exercised great and undisputed influence over the minds and actions of the people. Peter ridiculed the pomp of the clergy, reduced their influence, and nominated and confirmed himself as the Patriarch of all Christians within his dominions. For the Greek Church he substituted the Russian Church, a creation of his own. By moulding the spiritual power into abject subserviency to the temporal power, he widened the breach between the Church of the East and the Church of the West. Up to his time the dividing line between the religious creed professed by the Russians and that of the Latin Church had been the *filioque* in the creed. He destroyed all prospect of a union. He set himself up as both high priest and king, and became the first absolute ruler of the civil as well as of the religious concerns of all his subjects.

Even now the spiritual affairs of the realm are regulated by a standing council of bishops appointed by the Czar, and presided over generally by one of his aide-de-camps in uniform. The Council has virtually nothing else to do but to carry out the instructions which it pleases the Emperor to deliver to its presiding officer, and which he in turn imparts to the Council. Owing to this state of affairs, the clergy in Russia have lost by degrees the dignity which they once possessed; learning has almost entirely disappeared from among them, and so, too, religion has been degraded and reduced to an empty observance of rites and ceremonials. The two distinct classes into which the Russian clergy is divided, namely, the "white" and the "black" clergy, are at daggers' point. The parish-priest, who must be married, is compelled to submit to the dictates of the unmarried—the bishops and monks. According to the regulations of the Russian Church no one who is married can be ordained priest, so that the ecclesiastical students in the seminaries are married before orders are conferred upon them. The practice has obtained that the bishops select wives for these seminarists. For reasons of expediency the bishop's choice falls generally either upon the widow or the daughter of a deceased parish-priest; without consulting the wishes or inclinations of either of the parties to be married. In this arbitrary way the seminarist is provided with a scanty living, to which an undesired spouse and dependent relations are mostly annexed, and he submits to it with that stolid resignation which forms a characteristic feature

of the whole nation. The moral effect of this odious system may be easily imagined. To this must be added that the education given at the seminaries is of a most superficial character, hardly deserving the name education, and that the popes (parish-priests) are in most cases constrained to use the sacred office of minister of God as a means of extortion for obtaining their own and their families' support. Not a few exhibit publicly the most disgraceful examples of debauchery and drunkenness. Nor is this surprising if we recall to our minds the deeds of wanton cruelty and gross sensuality which the spiritual heads of the Russian Church have committed in the course of time, deeds that outrage the first principles of Christianity. Respect for virtue and honor have become extinct alike in clergy and laity, and in their stead vice and drunkenness seem to be at a premium.

Peter, however, did not foresee these disastrous consequences. What he aimed at was to make Russia a great nation with one language, one religion, and one will, and that will the Czar's will. His one aim was the attainment of earthly omnipotence. And the realization of this ideal has been the foremost thought and the highest ambition of his successors. Recognizing the importance of religious unity, he unscrupulously manufactured it, or a mechanical semblance of it, and bequeathed it to the Czars who succeeded him. It is a fact of comparatively recent occurrence that Nicholas has *forced* numbers of the adherents of the Orthodox Greek rite into the Russian Church.

The reign next in importance to Peter's as regards effects of a lasting character on Russia, is that of Catharine II. Her rule exemplifies conspicuously the extraordinary means possessed by the head of an absolute government for producing good or evil. As a genuine Czarina she used the imperial power to augment the importance of the crown and to draw tighter still the reins of irresponsible and arbitrary absolutism upon a nation harnessed to the state chariot. To the waning splendor of the old Russian nobility she gave a death-blow. Though deprived already under Peter of many privileges, the aristocracy up to Catharine's time had been allowed to act as an advisory body to the crown on public affairs. This interposition between sovereign and people Catharine abolished, and destroyed the political functions and power of Russian noblemen forever. This was done, seemingly, with the consent of the nation. The power of publishing ukases had existed before, it is true; but only after the Council of Moscow did a ukase become superior to all precedents, the one and the sole law of the land, superseding even all previous ukases. The last vestige of a position which entitled them to consideration, at least, was thereby withdrawn from the princely families of ancient

date. Up to the time of the French Revolution Catharine had fostered progress and civilization. But the moment that hydra showed itself in France, she changed entirely. French science and French literature were banished from her court, and the western frontier was carefully guarded, not only against the inroads of revolution, but likewise against the advance of culture and refinement. From that time on she baffled every project which tended to expand the intellectual or æsthetic horizon of Russian society; and in order to carry out her policy with success, she developed further the system of espionage which she found already in vogue. Nor did she fail in this, for she established an espionage as horrible and as degrading in character as it was complete in detail. It extended throughout the land, and reached every individual of every condition in every part of the world. This system has been one of the most fruitful sources of the frightful corruption which pervades every department of public service, and which the Czars have tried in vain to avert. The venality and corruption of Turkish officials have become proverbial. The venality and corruption among Russian office-holders, though less known, are greater in reality, and not only rival but outstrip the worst type of Pasha maladministration. Catharine's reign, however, derives its paramount importance, not from the fact that under her the sympathy of the nobility was alienated from the throne, nor from the fact that she checked the inflowing tide of progress by placing unlimited power in the hands of the secret police. Both measures were certainly bound to engender contempt, if not hatred, for a government whose strength lay in the success with which it oppressed its subjects. Catharine's reign is so important because she ingrafted the nation with an ulcer, which has poisoned its very life-blood and turned her epithet of "mother of the country" into a biting sarcasm.

The domestic life of the Russians of an earlier period was connected with such ideas of female chastity as are found to exist with more or less vigor among all barbarians. Before Catharine's day adultery was considered a most heinous crime, and in spite of the open depravity of Anna and Elizabeth, and of a rather lax morality among the higher classes, it continued to be punished by burying the guilty one alive up to the waist. Catharine changed the punishment for adultery into that of an ordinary crime. Not satisfied with herself setting an example of dishonor to her sex, she actually encouraged universal profligacy by opening and endowing "hospitals" for the offspring of adulterous mothers.

The parentless children who owed their existence to a free sway of the lowest of all animal passions have only to be deposited at a certain place in these institutions to gain admittance and be reared

at the expense of the state. It is optional with the mother to leave her name or the name she wishes the child to bear. At the hospital founded by Catharine in Moscow from six to eight hundred wet-nurses attend to the wants of the poor infants. Undeniably there is a philanthropic, nay, an almost touching side presented by thus caring for the guiltless offspring of guilt. But what affects the morality of the people is not the secondary, the philanthropic, but the primary element, namely, the ease of getting rid of the fruits of immorality. The close interdependence of religion and morality need not be dwelt upon here. On account of this, however, Peter had already been the forerunner of Catharine, for it was he, as we have observed, who made religion a ludicrous instrument in the hands of a despotic ruler. He destroyed the basis of morality and religion; his bad work was principally of a negative character. Catharine broached the positive side of the process of demoralizing the people.

Proceeding from these two sovereigns to the Czars of later date, the same conception of absolute power is found to have uniformly prevailed. Since the time of the French Revolution it seems to have been the firm determination of all the rulers of Russia not to permit any new idea or any new principle evolved by the progress of civilization to enter their realm. They rather endeavored to keep the Russians in ignorance that they had certain inalienable natural rights as human beings; they were anxious that the population should not discover that in other countries people of their own condition enjoyed certain privileges. To this system is traceable the order which forbade noblemen to reside abroad, and the censorship which is in full vigor to-day. The latter, indeed, is a measure which we cannot pass over without some cursory remarks.

There are nine commissioners or censors in Russia, and any publication not licensed by one of them is prohibited literature. All foreign books and papers with a grain of liberal opinion in them are tabooed; nor are native publications allowed to circulate, unless they have been approved or "corrected" by the censors. The natural consequence of this restriction is that all unlicensed books from abroad are not only eagerly sought after and read, but meditated upon as if their contents were Gospel truths. Nor is it, under these circumstances, surprising to learn that Russians of real culture have formed secret clubs for the purpose of making arrangements with booksellers for the purchase of unlicensed books, for only by this means can they keep abreast with the discoveries of the age. Nor is this all the mischief resulting from the attempt to check the invasion of foreign literature. The consequences are much more serious. In the course of time the secret clubs entered into a union among themselves, and now they have branches all

over the country. It is easy to understand how, in times like those of to-day in Russia, this network of societies may be changed into a most powerful political or revolutionary organization. Besides, the censorship debased the standard of native literature and lent a pernicious tone to the Russian publications abroad. Under the enjoyment of greater freedom of circulation of home and foreign literature the undue appetite for "forbidden fruits," common to perverse human nature, would not have produced results which it is impossible to deny are for Russia's government a source of danger.

One Nihilistic periodical is now published in London, entitled *Wpered* (*Forward*), and others are published in Geneva, Berne, and Amsterdam. These journals, printed expressly for contraband importation, certainly are, for the most part, abominable sheets. They cross the frontier in tin boxes, as we learn, and evade the vigilance of the custom-house officials, as shipments of sardines, canned fruits, preserved meat, condensed milk, and the like. It is sadly amusing to notice the ingenuity with which innocent enough looking tin boxes have been hit upon as the only safe vehicles of journalism.

We have said enough, we trust, to throw light upon the real condition of the Russia of to-day. The time has arrived, in our opinion, when in spite of unsparing despotism the dead level of contented ignorance can be maintained no longer. The whole population evinces a firm determination not to acquiesce any longer in a system which recognizes no rights at all, but which places everything, both in the spiritual and in the temporal order, at the mercy of an irresponsible despot. Whatever advance Russia has made in the path of education and intellectual culture during the last half century, has been essentially irreligious. There is no one to impart instruction in genuine religion; there is no one to make head against the swelling tide of immorality. There is no one to check the spread of skepticism; there is no one to heal the universal chronic disease of immorality.

The Russian empire of to-day is a mass of men sufficiently well instructed to be aware that they are excluded from a measure of political freedom which is enjoyed everywhere else in the civilized world. But this same mass of men is unacquainted with any religious or moral guide that may direct and control their efforts to obtain deliverance from the thralldom of ages. They are hemmed in on all sides by an army of officials which offers dogged resistance; which is as extortionate and oppressive as Pasha misrule. Can we wonder, therefore, that Nihilism found a suitable soil in Russia? Can we wonder that a populace driven to despair carries on a war of deliverance by terror and assassination against a gov-



ernment which tries to crush them back by sheer brute force into hopeless, passive submission? Or should we not rather wonder that a portion of Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century recalls to our minds the picture of some Asiatic tyrant in the far East, reigning, with apathetic indifference to their sufferings, over a number of turbulent hordes?

The revolutionary organ, *Land and Liberty*, refers in the following words to the draft of a constitution by Valousiff:

“A constitution is not what we want. What could we do with a constitution under present circumstances? So long as the country is denied all justice, a constitution would be of no use. Let us be given justice without distinction of persons and we shall be satisfied. But if the state goes on as before, our old programme must be maintained: ‘Death to the Court camarilla and death to all criminal officials.’”

This violent and uncompromising language is not altogether unaccountable if we remember that according to official statements only about 700 out of 56,000 persons transported to Siberia had been sentenced by courts of law.

We disclaim emphatically any intention of writing an apology of Nihilism. On the contrary, we condemn the Nihilistic doctrines without qualification; for the success of the Nihilists would throw the empire into a state of complete anarchy, and anarchy is no basis for the formation of a government properly balanced between law and liberty. Russia cannot be placed by violent proceedings on a line of march toward the position occupied by the other states of Europe. We have merely desired to point out that individuals of all ranks of Russian society who are now in great numbers arrested, incarcerated, court-martialled, shot, or exiled to a living death,—that these individuals do not deserve to be classed with ordinary social conspirators, whether Nihilist or Communist or Socialist. The ill-will of an official or an unjust suspicion is quite enough to secure the forfeiture of life and property, and not seldom a sentence of death.

The past sufferings of Russia explain her present deplorable condition; and her past and her present sufferings appeal to us strongly for sympathy with the sufferers. Not by revolution, nor by anarchy; not by war, nor by a reign of terror can the political regeneration of Russia be accomplished. Even in ages which could not boast of the superior intelligence of the nineteenth century the exercise of despotic power has always been precarious. But the days are now past when despotism can successfully contend against the ceaseless encroachments of Christian civilization. Retreat into the dark ages of Asiatic barbarity is impossible. In vain, therefore, does the Russian Government try to oppose the acceptance of the rules and regulations by which the family of Western nations are

governed. The spirit of the age, demanding religious liberty and public freedom, is at work in Russia. Her greatest need is the introduction of those elements which will free the nation from the fatal effects of Peter's and Catharine's reign; that is to say, replacement of shallow superstition by true religion, and a fresh supply of vigorous sound moral principles.

The history of Russia serves as a warning example that the so-called Christian religions do not stand on one and the same level. Outside of the Catholic Church Christianity (so-called) has not been able to produce civilization in the true meaning of this much-abused term. Protestantism has reached a stage of rapid decomposition. The Greek Church is but a weak shadow of its former self. And in spite of the deepseated religious craving of the Russian nation, we see what the mock Christianity of that Northern despotism has led to.

And as the creation of the Russian Church has been an act of the Czar, so the abandonment of the false position which the autocrat of the North fills must likewise proceed from him. Any thorough and effective reform can arise only from the disposition and the wishes of the Czar, as long as he unites in his person the majesty, both civil and religious, of the realm. The influence of one who combines the legislative and judicial functions *de jure* and *de facto*, as the Russian Emperor does, can hardly be exaggerated, if but exercised for the benefit of the people. The genius of true religion, of true culture, of true civilization, clamors for admittance at the portals of the empire. This spirit addresses the judgment and the virtues of the Czar, begging to be established beneath the fostering aid of his prodigious power. This spirit tries to wrest from the present sovereign not an unmeaning, momentary triumph; not the shadow or the name of liberty, but something worthy of a great ruler and lastingly beneficial to the happiness of a great nation. This spirit tries to teach him to yield by a free act of his own volition those prerogatives which have become untenable, and which will be forced from his successors if not from himself. And this same spirit also assures him that order and tranquillity flourish better under civil than under martial law; and that a return to true religion, or at least to religious toleration and security of person and property, would gratify his fondest aspirations after fame, and engrave his name indelibly and honorably on the record of history. But whether these truths, which, we think, must force themselves upon the attention of the Czar, will receive due consideration, or whether fear and pride will withstand the appeal they are making to his better feelings and judgment, remains to be seen.

## CARDINAL POLE.

*The History of the Life of Reginald Pole.* In two volumes. London, 1767.

*Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Chichester. Vol. viii., Reformation Period. London, Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty, 1869.

*Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism.* By Nicholas Souder, D.D., Sometime Fellow of New College, Oxford. Published A.D. 1585, with a continuation of the History, by the Rev. Edward Rishton, B.A., of Brasenose College, Oxford. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by David Lewis, M.A. London, Burns & Oates, 1877.

THE life of Reginald, Cardinal Pole is chiefly interesting to us from the steadfast devotion which it exhibits to the principle of Catholic unity. Not that it is otherwise at all unattractive; indeed, it is safe to say that from first to last it abounds in matter of a description most likely to win upon the reader. The singularly eventful period which it embraces, the historic importance of the personages and scenes introduced, its variety of incident, and the altogether uncommon cast of its leading features, arouse and rivet the attention as few lives have power to do. Many of these circumstances, however, independently of the special attractiveness which they may have in themselves, contribute greatly to heighten the interest which gathers about the main thought and motive of Pole's life. Whether we join him in the haunts of his literary leisure, or follow him on his generally unsuccessful embassies to royal and imperial courts; whether we view him as Legate to Trent, or on the point of election to the Papal See, we cannot forget that these various situations are incident upon, and, in a measure, the result of that decisive step which made him an exile and the object of prolonged and vindictive persecution for conscience sake. To the same cause must be largely attributed the alternate praise and blame heaped upon his memory. He has been exalted or cast down, glorified or defamed, according to the creed or religious bias of the writer. The motives which governed him were founded in selfishness and self-deception, or they sprang from an overwhelming sense of duty, just as his biographer happens to be of the same religious belief as his subject, or shares the antipapal animosity of his persecutor. While Catholics such as Phillips, for example, credit him in his consistent and strenuous opposition to the pretensions of his royal but ungodly relative, Henry VIII., with a fervor of piety and a depth of conviction equal to that which led

More and Fisher to the block, Dr. Hook labors with an assiduity, not at all compensated by his measure of success, to show that he was at heart a Protestant, but that "he mistook malignity for zeal," and, "through hostility to Henry, became a Papist." This latter opinion, it may be taken for granted, hardly meets the approval of the more fair-minded portion of Pole's countrymen.

Though it would be, indeed, a graceless office to tax with an intentional want of fairness one to whose thorough kindness of nature, and uprightness of character, Mr. Gladstone has recently borne such eloquent testimony, yet there is no disguising the fact, that throughout his life of Cardinal Pole there breathes a manifest bitterness of prejudice, which makes its perusal absolutely painful. It is, however, gratifying to note, notwithstanding the misleading influence of works of this class, the quite general approach, among non-Catholics, to a more dispassionate and enlightened temper of mind in the discussion of Catholic questions. Canon Oakley, in a very interesting contribution to the June number of the *Contemporary Review*, graphically traces the manifold evidences of change, in this respect, which has passed over the English people during the last fifty years. It leads to the earnest and reasonably grounded hope, that the day is not so far off when the non-Catholic historical biographer will recognize the wisdom of treating with candor, if not with exact impartiality, the lives of men who, like Pole, in a period of doctrinal strife were identified with the defence and propagation of Catholic principles.

Reginald Pole was born in March, A.D. 1500. His birthplace is subject to dispute; some say Stourton in Staffordshire; Dr. Hook quotes and agrees with Dallaway in giving the honor to Lordington in Sussex. His father, Sir Richard Pole, a brave and devoted adherent of Henry VII., died before Reginald, his third son, had completed his fifth year; and the sole care of his children, four sons and two daughters, fell to their affectionate mother, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury. This illustrious lady was daughter to Clarence, Duke of York, niece of Edward IV. and Richard III., and, through her mother, Isabel Neville, granddaughter of Earl Warwick, "the proud setter-up and puller-down of kings." Her life pathetically illustrates the extremes of wretchedness and happiness which close kinship with royalty frequently occasions. Her earlier years were saddened by the loss of her brother, Earl Warwick, the victim of the dark policy of Henry VII., who beheld in him a possible rival to his son. His daughter-in-law, the ill-fated Catharine, sought in after years, by the strongest mark of affectionate esteem, to make her some slight atonement for the grievous wrong then inflicted. She was chosen sponsor in confirmation to the Princess Mary, appointed her governess, and invested with the general

charge of her household. In this way it happened that Margaret's children were brought into familiar intercourse with the members of the royal family. Reginald's beauty and nobility of disposition won him the heart of the queen. It was current, at one period, that she was eager to wed him to her daughter, the Princess Mary, and the scheme met with popular approval. On the other hand, Henry destined him for the highest honors of the Church. Whatever may have been Reginald's views on this matter, his talents were certainly of an order eminently suited to the churchman. He acquired the rudiments of his education in the grammar school of the Carthusians, at West Sheen, not far from Richmond. He was but twelve years of age when he entered Oxford, and there, three years after, he received his degree as Bachelor of Arts. In pursuance of his design Henry did his best to promote the ecclesiastical advancement of the young scion of the Plantagenets. Before he had attained to his twentieth year, he found himself in the possession of two prebends, and dean of Wimbourne Minster in Dorsetshire.

About this time he left England, where More, Linacre, Colet, Fisher, and others of high literary name, looked with pleasure on his budding promise, to pursue under Henry's munificent patronage the congenial life of letters. He took up his residence in Padua, then the first university of Europe. There the charm of his manners, the dignity of his birth, and the persevering zeal with which he applied himself to the study of the classics soon made him remarkable. It was not long before he became an object of general esteem. His splendid establishment was thronged with the representatives of Paduan wit and culture. During the five or six years of his residence in that "Italy of Italy," as Erasmus styles Padua, his fame as a scholar became widely spread. He counted Erasmus, Bembo, and Sadoletto in the number of his correspondents. The life of his friend Lougoli, written in Latin, and published prior to his departure from Padua, was his first literary venture. Happy in its treatment, excellent in its style, free from the insane Ciceronianism of the period, which made slavish imitation of the Roman orator the supreme test of merit in composition, it confirmed the general opinion of his talents and the perfection of his classical scholarship.

A short visit to Rome, where he was treated with every mark of distinction by the famous Matthew Giberti, interrupted his long stay at Padua, to which he returned for a brief space before setting out for England. At no period of his life, very likely, did Reginald Pole taste of pleasure more exquisite than during that which immediately followed his arrival home. His residence in Italy, besides marking his first absence from his native land, had been suffi-

ciently protracted to create both in himself and in his kinsfolk the keenest longing for reunion. The fame of his success abroad had been wafted home on many a breeze, and his triumphs in the arena of letters had now become the common talk. The court, to which he was most heartily welcome, had no rival to its brilliancy and culture in English records. The education of Henry was in the main scholastic; he knew more of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas than of the practical duties of the statesman. "Shakespeare alone," writes Agnes Strickland, at the close of her eloquent panegyric, "Shakespeare alone has properly appreciated and vividly portrayed the great talents, as well as the moral worth, of the right royal Catharine of Arragon." Wolsey, the Magnificent, held the Great Seal; Thomas Linacre was Physician to the King; Richard Pace was Secretary of State; Cuthbert Tunstall was Master of the Rolls, and Sir Thomas More was Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Even the Church could desire no better or more dignified representative of her learning and holiness than the venerable John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. In such congenial society Reginald gave himself up to a season of unalloyed enjoyment. It was destined, however, to be of short duration. Vague hints and rumors of the king's dissatisfaction with Catharine, of his desire for a divorce, of his passion for a lady of his court, soon took form more substantial. It became public that the king questioned the validity of his marriage with his brother's widow, even though the impediment had been removed by dispensation; courts of inquiry were instituted. The case was referred to Rome, and, while professing to be willing to abide the Papal decision, threats alternated with prayers and promises in the effort to secure judgment in his favor. The shock of these events roused Pole to a keen sense of the painful nature of his position. To both sovereigns he stood in the attitude of debtor. In his boyhood he had been Catharine's special favorite. She was his mother's closest friend. It was her desire to bring about a marriage between her daughter Mary and himself, partly from the affection she bore him, mainly out of a spirit of vicarious reparation for the murder of his uncle Warwick. But, on the other side, Henry had proven himself a most generous benefactor. By his munificence he had been enabled to pursue his studies abroad in a manner suited to the dignity of his rank. He had been received on his return with the most evident tokens of his favor. It can hardly be doubted that Henry was naturally inclined to regard his brilliant and handsome young kinsman with a feeling warmer and stronger than that of mere esteem. So far as Henry's kindness could secure it a bright career lay before him. The embarrassment of his situation was daily becoming more evident. In a question so nearly affecting the wishes of the king and

the honor of the queen no member of the court could long remain neutral or inactive. Pending the Papal decision it was the course of prudence to keep aloof from the dangerous discussions and intrigues now rife in courtly circles. Anxious at once to escape from a scene so repugnant to his feelings, and to further perfect himself in the studies in which he delighted, Reginald sought and obtained the king's permission to retire from court and dwell once again among the tutors of his boyhood, the Carthusians of Sheen. At the end of two years the problem of divorce had grown more perplexed. In the minds of those best acquainted with the ungovernable temper of the king, and the calm, deep resolution of Catharine's character, there existed little, if any, hope of its satisfactory solution. With the lapse of time Pole felt his repugnance to interference increase. Acting on this feeling he besought Henry's leave to sojourn on the Continent. His request was somewhat reluctantly granted, and he proceeded to the University of Paris. Had he foreseen what was soon to follow he would have chosen to remain in his studious retreat. Despairing of success at Rome, where his agents were urgently pressing his claims, Henry turned to the universities, as if to counterbalance, with their purchased opinions, the anticipated failure of his suit before the Roman Pontiff. To his pain and amazement Pole found himself named president of a commission to obtain from the University of Paris an opinion in favor of the divorce. "Never," he says, some years afterwards, in his celebrated letter to Henry on the unity of the Church, "did I receive so sensible a stroke as from the disgraceful commission sent me when I was at Paris, whither I had retired that I might have no share in deliberations which were carrying on against the king's honor and interest within his own palace, under his directions, and by his authority." Rather than come to an open rupture with the king, of whose improvement he was still hopeful, he remained nominally in his ungracious office; and a couple of letters printed by Hook, as recently discovered, seem to show that he actually took some slight part in the proceedings; yet, after a year, so little had been done to further the object of the commission, that friends advised his return, lest the king might be led to regard him more as an enemy than as a friend. Accordingly he presented himself at court, and shortly resumed his studies at Sheen. A second two years spent in its monastic seclusion was destined to be abruptly ended. Wolsey, whose real greatness was best revealed in his repentance, had gone down to his grave, and the archiepiscopal chair of York was vacant. The policy of Cromwell and Cranmer, by which the king was now altogether guided, required that it be filled by one pledged to support the divorce, the very name of which was fast becoming obnoxious to the people. It was a great

office, and the name and weight of a great incumbent were imperatively needed to bring the balance of public opinion to turn in the king's favor.

Notwithstanding his youth, for he was only in his thirty-second year, the name of Reginald Pole was the first to suggest itself to the royal advisers. The spotlessness of his moral character shone with a lustre all the brighter from the contrast it afforded to a profligate court. His abilities were unquestioned. The Plantagenets were bound up in much of what was most splendid in English history. To the people the noblest representative of that illustrious race could never become an object of indifference. Moreover, his relations with the king were of so peculiar a nature as would seem to place him in the attitude of an absolute dependent on the royal bounty, and were taken as the strongest guarantee of subservience to his Majesty's will and pleasure. Even should this link fail, the sincerity and thoroughness of his affection for Henry could not be doubted. When, therefore, the Duke of Norfolk surprised Pole in his retirement with the dazzling offer of a Metropolitan See, on condition that he should oppose no bar to the divorce, he was at least equally surprised, as well as greatly chagrined, to meet with a decided refusal. After much urgent solicitation, and, in order that no direct offence might be given to the king, Reginald consented to take time for thought, and within a month submit his final answer. News of his hesitancy immediately brought his less scrupulous friends about him. It was the hour for a wise and courageous counsellor, and, at this crucial moment, Pole does not seem to have been thus blest. Representations of the most plausible nature were showered thick before him, and at last, against his own better judgment, he consented to satisfy the king. Overjoyed at the prospect of Pole's acquiescence, Henry appointed York Palace as the place of meeting. Never did an interview result in a more unexpected ending. Face to face with the king, the iniquity of the course which he was on the point of entering burst fully upon him. The specious reasoning by which he had been thus far partially blinded vanished the moment he summoned it to practically justify and support his conduct. Conviction and feeling were irresistibly on the side of Catharine; and Henry, instead of receiving, as he had been led to expect, the thanks of his favored kinsman, heard, with an astonishment and rage which he took no pains to conceal, a vigorous argument and passionately eloquent appeal for complete reconciliation with the queen. The unreserved and emphatic terms in which Reginald poured forth his innermost thoughts on this remarkable occasion may be taken as a declaration of principles on the fateful question of divorce, from which he never thereafter departed. The consequences of that



interview are plainly traceable throughout his after-life. Though Pole's conduct was a sharp disappointment to Henry, yet, in his calmer moments, he must have inwardly acknowledged that it was the surest pledge of his sincerity and devotedness. That he was deeply impressed by his kinsman's arguments is evident from the fact that, when the first outburst of wrath had died away, he commanded him to reduce them to writing. Referring to the document thus elicited, Cranmer observed that "it was written with so much wisdom that Mayster Raynold Pole might be of the council of the king's grace, and with such eloquence that, if it were set forth and known to the common people, it were not possible to persuade them to the contrary."

After the part Pole had taken it will be readily conjectured that his position in England grew daily more irksome. It now became his aim to withdraw himself from a scene where his presence, to say the least, must be regarded as a standing but unprofitable protest. Avignon offered a retreat most suited to his taste, and thither with the royal permission he betook himself, to begin what proved to be a long and eventful exile. At the end of a year, devoted to the study of sacred literature, his failing health warned him off to a climate more genial, and he removed to Padua, the scene of earlier studies and happier days. It is especially interesting at this period to note the growth of Pole's friendships. They were formed mainly with men standing on the topmost plane of literary and scientific attainment. A complete list of those with whom he was on terms of the most familiar and confidential intercourse, would represent a large proportion of the acknowledged leaders of Italy's religious and intellectual life. Bembo, "whose name," says Hallam, "among the polished writers of Italy, we meet with on every side;" Matthew Giberti, Bishop of Verona, the discipline of whose diocese was the envy of St. Charles; Sadoletto, great alike in the depths of his humility and learning; Morone, like Pole himself, a zealous reformer, a legate to the Council of Trent, and wellnigh the choice of a Conclave; Contarini, who was summoned from the council-chamber of Venice to the side of Paul III. as special adviser; the celebrated Hosius. All these became Cardinals, and that, upon a first acquaintance, such rare judges of human character should tender Pole their sincere friendship is a proof, not only of the singular charm of his manners and conversation, but also of the high order of his moral and intellectual endowments. Over others of natures not less noble he cast the same irresistible spell. With Lampidio and Buonamico, both men of great abilities, he bound himself in ties which only death had power to sunder. The Duke of Palliano and his wife, the beautiful and gifted Giulia Gonzaga, delighted in his society. He became after the death of Con-

tarini the adviser of a truly great woman, Vittoria Colonna, the widow of the Marquis Pescara. She was a poet who in that age of ripe culture wrote verses to equal Bembo's; she filled a daughter's place and exerted a daughter's influence over Michael Angelo. "I was born a rough model," said the immortal artist, "and it was for her to reform and remake me."

Through her in all likelihood it was that he became known to the grand old man whose declining steps she so lovingly guided and supported. It is not unreasonable to assume that Buonarotti was pleased with the noble and ascetic character of the young Englishman, and it may well be taken as a token of his esteem that he immortalized, what Agnes Strickland styles Pole's "grand person and features, the perfect model of beauty," in painting him as the Saviour in his picture of Christ raising Lazarus. In his own household we find a veritable "fidus Achates" in Luigi Priuli, a wealthy Venetian, who, as Dr. Hook justly remarks, "left his home and country to form part of Pole's establishment, or rather found his home and his country wherever Reginald Pole took up his abode." With Priuli we must class Beccatelli, his faithful secretary and biographer, and, after Pole's death, Archbishop of Ragusa; and Marco Antonio Flaminio, a poet, a man of the finest tastes, a classical scholar of the highest standing, and more than this, a Christian, whose tender yet solid piety was a spur to the ascetism of Pole. He must, indeed, draw largely on the good-will of fortune who could wish for his favorite a more distinguished and attractive circle. Such another company it would be difficult to find in Christendom; and it found in the grace, freshness, and intense religious earnestness of Reginald Pole an enduring attraction. But this was Italy, Pole felt, and not England. The brightness of his life was on the surface; its gloom lay heavy and deep on a heart that bled for its native land. There the scene was as dark and repellent as that in Italy was luminous and alluring.

Prior to his departure from England the royal supremacy had been declared by Convocation, of which Reginald by right of his ecclesiastical holding was a member, though absent when the disgraceful measure was enacted. Within the four years following affairs under the ministry of the unscrupulous Cromwell had taken on a gloomier aspect. Without sentence of divorce Henry had secretly married Anne Boleyn. Five months after this Cranmer pronounced a decree of divorce from Catharine, and declared the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn lawful. It had been repeatedly set forth by statute that the Pope had no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop. His name, by order of the king, was stricken out of all "books of the churches." Dispensations were, thenceforward, granted on the authority of the king

and the archbishops. It was declared treason to say that the king was either heretic or schismatic. It was treason to deny his spiritual supremacy. For refusing to acknowledge it Richard Reynolds, a Brigittin, John Haile, Vicar of Isleworth, and six Carthusians,—a name dear to Pole,—three Priors and three monks were martyred at Tyburn. Shortly after John, Cardinal Fisher, the wisest as well as the most illustrious of Henry's anointed victims, calmly approached the block reciting a passage of St. John's Gospel on which his eye had chanced to fall: "This is everlasting life to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." On the fourteenth day following the blood of Sir Thomas More gave to that same block a new consecration. Events soon made it quite manifest that the spiritual supremacy of the king would prove a costly matter to the "Church" which he had condescended to govern. By act of Parliament the first fruits and the first year's revenue of all benefices were granted to the king for the support of his new office. The dissolution of the lesser monasteries for the good of religion, and the sequestration of their property for the good of the king, was enacted, soon after, by the same august assembly. It was evident that the savagely despotic course on which Henry had now fully entered must result in irretrievable injury to the ancient religion. German heresy had already obtained a foothold in the land, and throve under the shadow of the Anglican schism. The religious instincts and convictions of a whole people were not to be ruthlessly violated without eventually creating a deplorable havoc in its morals. The transfer of spiritual allegiance, under penalty of death, from the successor of Christ to the heir of Henry VII. was a blow at legitimate authority most favorable to a second religious revolt. From schism to heresy is perhaps an easier step than that which leads from orthodoxy into schism, and it is hardly a matter for surprise if many who found themselves schismatics, by obedience to the ruling of a tyrant, should under the impulse of passion or a desire for change, or won by the charm of novelty, lapse yet farther from the truth. To this pass had matters come in England, and thus far there had been no open rupture between Pole and the king. Had Reginald been resident in any part of the realm during this period, there can be no doubt but that he would have shared the fate of Fisher and More.

. The execution of these great men made it plain that no claims of former affection, of personal obligation, of public service, of eminent ability, of high and sacred station, of saintly life, would be suffered to weigh with the king if opposed even by silence to his sacrilegious usurpation. It was left for Reginald Pole to discover that not even inoffensive absence was able to secure a suspected

subject from the effects of the royal vengeance. What seemed a kindly wish was expressed by Henry and his Machiavellian minister, Cromwell, for Pole's return, on the ground that the benefit of his great acquirements was now needed in England. Had this invitation reached Pole two years earlier it would have been accepted; as it was it came far too late, and the lure failed. He was then requested to write a treatise in favor of the royal supremacy. The message met with the only answer it deserved—silence. Dr. Starkey, a former friend of Pole, was next commissioned by Henry to obtain his candid judgment on the questions of supremacy and divorce. At the same time Cromwell wrote urging his return, no matter what his opinions on the vexed questions might be. In a letter to Starkey he promised compliance, expressed the affection he still bore the king, and his desire to do him real service; but still, for the sake of the dear ones at home, he put off his answer. A second and a third time Starkey was directed to write and demand an explicit statement of his views on the questions proposed. Pole could be silent no longer. The time had arrived, at last, when come what might the thoughts and feelings which had long burned for utterance must have issue—at how dire a cost he could scarcely have imagined. Good Queen Catharine was at rest. Five months had not elapsed from the day of her demise, when Anne Boleyn displayed her vindictive levity on the scaffold. It seemed to Pole that now if ever the time was come of making Henry remorsefully conscious of the enormity of his crimes, that now if ever his repentance might be looked for. Under the pressure of these motives, overcharged with the conflicting memories which Henry's reign suggested, he flung himself into the composition of his celebrated treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*. His own analysis of the work, and description of the circumstances which led to its production, as sent some years later to Charles V., are interesting.

"Many reasons concurred to reduce me to the necessity of undertaking this subject. The first of which was the king's positive commands to write, though not indeed against himself, yet the subject on which he ordered me to send him my opinion brought on this consequence. I had retired from my country and friends, at a time when they became most dear and necessary, that I might have no share in measures which I could not approve and must have been involved in had I stayed. I should have been under a necessity either of acting against my own conviction, the king's honor, and the welfare of my country if I consented to what he required; or, on my refusal, of provoking his indignation against myself and all who belonged to me. My tenderness for him, however, was such that no authority, no persuasion had yet been able to make me depart from the resolution I had taken of being silent on these matters, though several persons for whom I had the greatest deference were of opinion I ought to have acted otherwise. He sent, therefore, his commands when he had not the least reason to suspect I should interfere with his proceedings; when there was no farther room for deliberation; when his resolution was taken, and he had made it capital for any one to oppose it. This law was enacted with such vigor that no merit

however conspicuous could screen those whom it included. The two greatest lights which this island had seen<sup>1</sup> were put to death for refusing to comply with it. These examples he knew were come to my knowledge, and he vainly imagined the terror of their influence, and the desire of returning to my own country and acquaintance, which otherwise I must forever relinquish, would bring me to a compliance; and, in that case, my authority would be of greater weight with my countrymen, as I had hitherto been more backward in yielding to his will. His orders were that I should send him my opinion in terms so clear and explicit as to exclude all ambiguity and subterfuge, and if I failed in so doing I should incur his highest displeasure. Had the case been of a doubtful nature and not openly repugnant to the divine law, the affection I bore my country and relations might have been a powerful inducement to act as I was required. For as to the penalties with which I was threatened, and the violent deaths of those great men which were placed before my eyes, they were so far from alarming my fears that I saw in them the strongest motives to support with an unshaken resolution the cause in which they had lain down their lives. And if the alternative was not to be avoided, I would have renounced whatever was desirable rather than purchase the enjoyment on the terms which the king offered. . . . The work is divided into four books. In the first of these I refute the supremacy the king has taken on him self, and a treatise written in defence of it, which by his orders was sent me from England. The second asserts the prerogative of the See of Rome, and answers the objections made against it. In the third I sound in the king's ear the voice which the guiltless blood he has shed and the horror of his other actions raises up to heaven against him. Having thus discharged what I owed to truth and my country's welfare I cast myself at the king's feet; I conjure him to take in good part what I had said, as it proceeded from zeal and affection, and on this consideration to excuse me if anywhere I seem to exceed those bounds which custom has prescribed to subjects when they treat with their prince."

From the appearance of the book in England may be dated the relentless persecution to which Pole was subjected up to the time of Henry's death. It was not the custom of the age to mince phrases, and there were certainly very few qualified expressions to be found in Pole's denunciation of the king's conduct. During his long reign no subject had ever dared to address royalty in a tone approaching it in boldness. Its stern severity of rebuke, as used towards a sovereign, has never been surpassed. Even Contarini, to whom he submitted his work for revision, was startled at its indignant frankness. Pole's justification rests mainly on the fact that he intended it for the perusal of the king alone, and as a proof of his sincerity in this respect he could never be persuaded to publish it until, some years after Henry's death, a pirated copy, disfigured with the most malicious comments, having appeared in Germany, he determined at last to give it to the world under his own name. Moreover, it never would have been written had not gentler measures utterly failed, and there was besides no one in England in a position to send the king a perfectly free and candid remonstrance on the iniquity of his proceedings. Henry masked his rage beneath an assumption of calmness. Pole was commanded on his

---

<sup>1</sup> Fisher and Moore.

allegiance to return immediately. "This," observes the sagacious Dr. Hook, "was the proper and dignified course to be pursued, though the advocates of Pole represent it as an absurd proceeding. It placed Pole entirely in the wrong if he refused." Reginald himself gave terse expression to his thoughts on this subject when, quoting the fable, he said: "I have seen many animals go into the lion's den but I never saw any come out." The burden of the numerous letters which were sent to him was identical, and pointed to a common source of inspiration: "Obey the king." Reginald answered: "I will return to England when I can do so with honor and safety. Repeal the law which makes it death to deny the royal supremacy."

A breach of this sort with Henry was sufficiently alarming, as Pole keenly felt, to endanger his personal safety; and the drift affairs were taking in Italy could not fail to widen it. The attitude of the English court towards Rome was, of course, one of open hostility, and that any subject of Henry should hold friendly and official relations with the See which had pronounced against the divorce, was regarded by him as tantamount to treason. The throes of the religious disturbances agitating Europe were convulsing its politics as well as its morals. Governments felt the ground of opinion and principle on which they rested heaving, shifting, dividing beneath them. The necessity was evident of convening a General Council in which the radical causes of religious discontent might be fully investigated and remedied. As a preparatory step towards this important end Paul III. summoned to his side the holiest and ablest counsellors in Italy. Reginald Pole was surprised by a Papal brief commanding his assistance in the preparation of subject-matter for the deliberations of the prospective Council. With his usual candor he made haste to apprise the king of his movements by instantly dispatching a copy of the brief to Cromwell. In company with Caraffa, Sadoletto, Cortese, and others, he was at Verona, on his way to Rome, when a courier from England arrived, bearing letters from Cromwell, Tunstall, his mother, and Lord Montague his brother, dissuading him from attendance at the Papal court. The situation was a trying one. A further advance might result in ruin to his kindred, yet the commands of the Pope were not to be lightly disregarded. Pole hesitated, and sought the advice of his companions. Their unanimous counsel decided his course, and he continued his journey to Rome, where he was royally received and assigned quarters in the Papal palace. A commission of nine, of which Reginald was the youngest member, was appointed under the presidency of Cardinal Contarini to consider and state the proper matter for reform. Its labors extended over a space of two years.

According to Phillips, Pole was "the directing mind that governed and guided the whole." As the best recognition of his abilities and services he was charged with the draft of its report, and when a few years afterwards it was thought advisable to make that report public, it appeared over Pole's signature alone. He was but a few months in Rome when he was named member of the Sacred College. The choice met with general approval, though in England its chief effect was to embitter more deeply the mind of its unprincipled monarch. While Reginald himself was sincerely grateful for the honor, he was notwithstanding somewhat unwilling to accept it. Thus far he had not so much as received tonsure. His leanings, however, were towards the Church, and on the 22d of December, 1536, he became an Ecclesiastic and a Cardinal. It was hardly two months prior to this event that a formidable insurrection had broken out in the north of England, among those who had determined to put a stop, at all risks, to the spoliation of Church property incessantly carried on by the minions of their schismatic ruler. They marched under a banner representing the crucifixion of Christ, as significant of the wounds under which his spouse was suffering. Enthusiasm was intense and widespread. The issue, however, was not a gain for the insurgents. Nevertheless, the outbreak was a sign full of promise to those who hoped for the spiritual well-being of England. As such Paul III. regarded it. He was of opinion that the time was now come when, with a reasonable prospect of success, an effort might be made to bring Henry to a course of conduct more consonant with the welfare of religion. To the Pope as well as to the ambassadors of Charles V. at Rome and London, no one seemed so likely to succeed as the newly-made Cardinal; and, on their advice, he was named to what Dr. Lingard rightly terms "a very delicate but dangerous mission." Pole had not concealed from the king his real sentiments with regard to the right of the people to seek a redress of their grievances. In his work on the Unity of the Church, intended, as has been said, solely for the eye of the king, he had frankly declared that the repeated violation of the rights guaranteed by Magna Charta to Church and people, had dissolved the contract which made allegiance a duty. But these convictions he did not seek to propagate. To use a simile of his own, he sought to heal the disorders which afflicted the body of his native land by applying a remedy to the head in which they originated. He sought the salvation of his country not by force of arms, but by force of reason. It was, therefore, quite natural, and to be expected, as a part of the consistent line of conduct which he had followed throughout in his dealings with the king, that on receiving his credentials as legate to the courts of France, the Nether-

lands, Scotland, as well as to the people of England, he should forward to Henry an account of the scope and aim of his instructions. These were, as he wrote to Cardinal Pio, to promote a peace between Charles V. and Francis I., to dispose them to the convocation of a General Council, and endeavor, through the mediation of Francis, with whom Henry was at peace, to win the latter back to the Communion which he had abandoned.

He had not yet set out from Rome when a remonstrance reached him, signed by many members of both houses of Parliament, condemning in the severest terms his work on the Unity of the Church, and his conduct in proceeding to Rome and acceptance of the Cardinalate against the wishes of the king. He seized on the opportunity to justify himself, and made of his answer a masterly vindication of the course he had adopted. In language at once eloquent and temperate, he cited the arguments already noted as a sufficient apology for his treatise. Then referring to himself he said: "What is the reason, my lords and gentlemen, that I have been so long deprived of my country, my relations, and of everything that is dear to man? Why am I an outlaw? Why is a price set upon my head? Am I driven from home from any crime of mine or of those I belong to? Did I want means or ability to rise to honors in my own country?" He appeals to his memorable refusal of the See of York in proof that the king's honor and welfare were dearer to him than any emolument. And then, touching on the charge of disobedience, he shows that neither in his residence at Rome in submission to the Papal command, nor in his recent elevation to the Sacred College, was there anything inconsistent with his former conduct or with his duty as a loyal subject.

To trace at length Pole's career as a legate would encroach too largely on the narrow limits of a sketch such as this. It was made up of a succession of grievous trials hardly relieved, except for the consolation he derived from communion with God, and the comfort he received from the deep and tireless sympathy of his friends. The vengeance of Henry met him everywhere. He arrived in France to find its king, intimidated by threats, practically opposed to the success of his mission. He was requested to leave the kingdom, informed that he had been declared guilty of high treason in England, and that a reward of fifty thousand crowns was offered to the assassin who should dispatch him. He withdrew to Flanders, in the hope of favorable treatment from its sovereigns, Charles V. and Mary, the nephew and niece of Catharine, to be told that its Privy Council had been tempted with an offer of four thousand infantry, fed and furnished for ten months, on condition of his delivery into the hands of Henry's agents. Spies dogged his movements; bravoës lay in wait for his steps. The august dignity



his talents in a station more conspicuous. The legates appointed were the Cardinals Parisius, Morone, and Pole. Fresh difficulties arising, the Council was indefinitely adjourned. Two years past away before it opened its first session. Pole was again named legate, this time in conjunction with the Cardinals Del Monte and Marcello Cervini, both destined to be respectively the next occupants of the Papal chair. The wrath of Henry was not yet extinguished. Pole was on the point of setting out for the Council when he was warned, by a letter from the Cardinal Bishop of Trent, of a plot to assassinate him on his journey. Compelled to put off his departure he made use of his leisure to compose an excellent treatise—inserted by Labbe among the decrees and canons of the Council—on the nature and end of General Councils. He finally proceeded under an armed escort to Mantua, thence he journeyed by less frequented ways safely to Trent. Here unremitting service and an uncongenial climate told heavily on his health, and he retired to Padua. On its restoration he was kept at Rome to act as Papal Counsellor in the intricate questions debated in the Council. The course of the next three years witnessed the removal by death of two sovereigns, Henry and Paul, who in their relations with Pole were contrasted as his greatest enemy, and his greatest benefactor. The friendship of the Pope began where that of the king ended, and the reasons which endeared him to the former occasioned the hatred of the latter. It may be justly said that the measure of his standing rose in Rome in a degree proportionate to its fall in London; and if the character, not only of the rulers themselves but of the men by whom they were surrounded be taken in consideration, no higher testimony of Reginald Pole's merit as a man and as a Christian may be imagined. Beccatelli and Priuli entered with Pole as his attendants into the Conclave which elected Paul's successor. In their long and familiar intercourse with him they had the amplest opportunities of forming a correct estimate of his exalted character. They knew how calm and even cheerful he could be under reverses, how forgiving under the gravest injuries, how perfectly his own master under trials the most agonizing; but adversity is not the only touchstone of moral greatness, nor perhaps the truest. To a truly great mind and heart, for the vast scope and numberless instrumentalities it affords of well-doing, no prize is so tempting to the soul blinded with earthly ambition, none so overwhelmingly dazzling, as that which it is in the power of the Conclave to offer. That of which Pole was a member lasted above two months without being able to declare its choice. Throughout this protracted period of suspense neither the agitation of his companions nor the growing probability of his own election availed to disquiet him. To its close he preserved his tranquillity unbroken,

a scholar, his dignity as legate, his influence on the intellectual activity of his day, in the contemplation of a life of serene endurance and constant self-sacrifice. His sufferings are ever before us, and if we rejoice in his successes and exult in the tributes conceded to his merit, it is mainly because they tend, in some measure, to their alleviation. It is the analysis of this feeling of sympathy which leads us up to the true conception of his character. The secret of his influence over us lies in his exquisite sense of right, and in his inflexible resolution in acting up to and abiding in it. His misfortunes flow from this source; and we are touched by them, not simply because they are misfortunes, but because they are incurred in defence of the right. His life is the expression of this principle. It is the only one which can afford a rational explanation of his conduct. The divorce was a gross violation of natural right, and therefore he opposed it. The schism was an outrage on revealed truth, and hence he devoted his life to the task of closing it. And it is this principle, too, which constitutes his charm, not only when it appears in affairs of public concern, but also as it is seen operating in those of a purely private and personal nature. If he is tranquil and patient under the annoyances which beset his various embassies; if, even though a Cardinal, he is accustomed to serve Mass at Viterbo; if he pardons the criminals who sought his life, and forgives their abettor; if, after the murder of his brother, he expresses, in writing, his willingness to lay down his life for the salvation of the king; or, in the Conclave, displays the heroism of perfect self-control; in all these things we recognize the grandeur of a soul which made its conception of right the aim and rule of action. His goodness is, beyond question, his strongest title to greatness. This fact is his highest praise; for the names of men intellectually great are common in history, while the names of those who were also pre-eminently good are comparatively rare.

---

requiritur philosophiae usus, ut sacra Theologia naturam, habitum, ingeniumque verae scientiae suscipiat atque induat. In hac enim nobilissima disciplinarum magnopere necesse est, ut multae ac diversae caelestium doctrinarum partes in unum veluti corpus colligantur, ut suis quaeque locis convenienter dispositae, et ex propriis principiis derivatae apto inter se nexu cohaereant; demum ut omnes et singulae suis iisque invictis argumentis confirmentur.—Nec silentio praetereunda, aut minimi facienda est accuratior illa atque uberior rerum, quae creduntur, cognitio, et ipsorum fidei mysteriorum, quoad fieri potest, aliquanto lucidior intelligentia, quam Augustinus aliique Patres et laudarunt et assequi studuerunt, quamque ipsa Vaticana Synodus<sup>1</sup> fructuosissimam esse decrevit. Eam siquidem cognitionem et intelligentiam plenius et facilius certe illi consequuntur, qui cum integritate vitae fideique studio ingenium coniungunt philosophicis disciplinis expoliturum, praesertim cum eadem Synodus Vaticana doceat, eiusmodi sacrorum dogmatum intelligentiam *tum ex eorum, quae naturaliter cognoscuntur, analogia; tum e mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo* peti oportere.<sup>2</sup>

Postremo hoc quoque ad disciplinas philosophicas pertinet, veritates divinitus traditas religiose tueri, et iis qui oppugnare audeant resistere. Quam ad rem, magna est philosophiae laus, quod fidei propugnaculum ac veluti firmum religionis munimentum habeatur. *Est quidem*, sicut Clemens Alexandrinus testatur, *per se perfecta et nullius indiga Servatoris doctrina, cum sit Dei virtus et sapientia. Accedens autem graeca philosophia veritatem non facit potentior; sed cum debiles efficiat sophistarum adversus eam argumentationes, et propulset dolosos adversus veritatem insidias, dicta est vineae apta sepes et vallus.*<sup>3</sup> Profecto sicut inimici catholici nominis, adversus religionem pugnaturi, bellicos apparatus plerumque a philosophica ratione mutuuntur, ita divinarum scientiarum defensores plura e philosophiae penu depromunt, quibus revelata dogmata valeant propugnare. Neque mediocriter in eo triumphare fides christiana censenda est, quod adversariorum arma, humanae rationis artibus ad nendum comparata, humana ipsa ratio potenter expediteque repellat. Quam speciem religiosi certaminis ab ipso gentium Apostolo usurpatam commemorat S. Hieronymus scribens ad Magnum: *Ductor christiani exercitus Paulus et orator invictus, pro Christo causam agens, etiam inscriptionem fortuitam arte torquet in argumentum fidei didicerat enim a vero David extorquere de manibus hostium gladium, et Goliath superbissimi caput proprio mucrone truncare.*<sup>4</sup> Atque ipsa Ecclesia istud a philosophia praesidium christianos doctores petere non tantum suadet, sed etiam iubet. Etenim Concilium Lateranense V. posteaquam constituit, *omnem assertionem veritati illuminatae fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse, eo quod verum vero minime contradicat,*<sup>5</sup> philosophiae doctoribus praecipit, ut in dolosis argumentis dissolvendis studiose versentur; siquidem, ut Augustinus testatur, *si ratio contra divinarum Scripturarum auctoritatem redditur, quamlibet acuta sit, fallit veri similitudine; nam vera esse non potest.*<sup>6</sup>

Verum ut pretiosis hisce, quos memoravimus, afferendis fructibus par philosophia inveniatur, omnino oportet, ut ab eo tramite numquam deflectat, quem et veneranda Patrum antiquitas ingressa est, et Vaticana Synodus solemni auctoritatis suffragio comprobavit. Scilicet cum plane compertum sit, plurimas ex ordine supernaturali veritates esse accipien-

<sup>1</sup> Const. cit., cap. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Strom. lib. i. c. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Epist. ad Magn.

<sup>5</sup> Bulla Apostolici regiminis.

<sup>6</sup> Epist. 143 (al. 7), ad Marcellin. n. 7.

dales suos, doctrinis S. Thomae studere et religiosius haerere, cauto, ne cui eorum impune liceat a vestigiis tanti viri vel minimum discedere. Ut Dominicanam familiam praetereamus, quae summo hoc magistro iure quodam suo gloriatur, ea lege teneri Benedictinos, Carmelitas, Augustinianos, Societatem Iesu, aliosque sacros Ordines complures, statuta singulorum testantur.

Atque hoc loco magna cum voluptate provolat animus ad celeberrimas illas, quae olim in Europa floruerunt, Academias et Scholas, Parisiensem nempe, Salmantinam, Complutensem, Duacenam, Tolosanam, Lovaniensem, Patavinam, Bononiensem, Neapolitanam, Conimbricensem, aliasque permultas. Quarum Academiarum nomen aetate quodammodo crevisse, rogatasque sententias, cum graviora agerentur negotia, plurimum in omnes partes valuisse, nemo ignorat. Iamvero compertum est, in magnis illis humanae sapientiae domiciliis, tamquam in suo regno, Thomam consedissem principem; atque omnium vel doctorum vel auditorum animos miro consensu in unius angelici Doctoris magisterio et auctoritate conquievisse.

Sed, quod pluris est, Romani Pontifices Praedecessores Nostri sapientiam Thomae Aquinatis singularibus laudum praeconiis, et testimoniis amplissimis prosecuti sunt. Nam Clemens VI.,<sup>1</sup> Nicolaus V.,<sup>2</sup> Benedictus XIII.<sup>3</sup> alique testantur, admirabili eius doctrina universam Ecclesiam illustrari; S. Pius V.<sup>4</sup> vero fatetur eadem doctrina haereses confusas et convictas dissipari, orbemque universum a pestiferis quotide liberari erroribus; alii cum Clemente XII.,<sup>5</sup> uberrima bona ab eius scriptis in Ecclesiam universam dimanasse, Ipsumque eodem honore colendum esse affirmant, qui summis Ecclesiae doctoribus, Gregorio, Ambrosio, Augustino et Hieronymo defertur; alii tandem S. Thomam proponere non dubitarunt Academiis et magnis Lyceis exemplar et magistrum, quem tuto pede sequerentur. Qua in re memoratu dignissima videntur B. Urbani V. verba ad Academiam Tolosanam: *Volumus et tenore praesentium vobis iniungimus, ut B. Thomae doctrinam tamquam veridicam et catholicam sectemini, eandemque studeatis totis viribus ampliare.*<sup>6</sup> Urbani autem exemplum Innocentius XII.<sup>7</sup> in Lovaniensi studiorum Universitate, et Benedictus XIV.<sup>8</sup> in Collegio Dyonyssiano Granatensium renovarunt.—His vero Pontificum maximorum de Thoma Aquinate iudiciis, veluti cumulus, Innocentii VI. testimonium accedat: *Huius (Thomae), doctrina prae ceteris, excepta canonica, habet proprietatem verborum, modum dicendorum, veritatem sententiarum, ita ut numquam qui eam tenuerint, inveniantur a veritatis tramite deviasse; et qui eam impugnaverit, semper fuerit de veritate suspectus.*<sup>9</sup>

Ipsa quoque Concilia Oecumenica, in quibus eminet lectus ex toto orbe terrarum flos sapientiae, singularem Thomae Aquinati honorem habere perpetuo studuerunt. In Conciliis Lugdunensi, Viennensi, Florentino, Vaticano, deliberationibus et decretis Patrum interfuisse Thomam et pene praefuisse dixeris, adversus errores Graecorum, haereticorum et rationalistarum ineluctabili vi et faustissimo exitu decertantem.—Sed haec maxima est et Thomae propria, nec cum quopiam ex doctoribus catholicis communicata laus, quod Patres Tridentini, in ipso medio conclavi ordini habendo, una cum divinae Scripturae codicibus et Pontificum Maximorum decretis *Summam* Thomae Aquinatis super altari patere voluerunt, unde consilium, rationes, oracula peterentur.

<sup>1</sup> Bulla In Ordine.<sup>2</sup> Breve ad FF. Ord. Praedic. 1451.<sup>3</sup> Bulla Pretiosus.<sup>4</sup> Bulla Mirabilis.<sup>5</sup> Bulla Verbo Dei.<sup>6</sup> Const. 5.<sup>a</sup> dat. die 3 Aug. 1386 ad Cancell. Univ. Tolos.<sup>7</sup> Litt. in form. Brev., die 6 Febr. 1694.<sup>8</sup> Litt. in form. Brev., die 21 Aug. 1752.<sup>9</sup> Serm. de S. Thom.

Nostrae benevolentiae testem, Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, universoque Klero et populo singulis commisso, peramanter in Domino impertimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 4 Augusti an. 1879, Pontificatus Nostri anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[TRANSLATION.]

# ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD.

LEO XIII.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

*To all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic world holding grace and communion with the Apostolic See.*

*To our Venerable Brethren all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, of the Catholic world, in grace and communion with the Apostolic See,*

LEO XIII.

*Venerable Brethren: Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

THE only begotten Son of the Eternal Father, who appeared on earth that he might bring salvation and the light of divine wisdom to the human race, conferred a great and wonderful benefit on the world, when, on the point of ascending again to heaven, He commanded the Apostles that *going forth they should teach all nations*,<sup>1</sup> and left the Church founded by Himself the common and supreme teacher of the peoples. For men, whom the truth had made free, were to be preserved by the truth, nor would the fruits of the heavenly doctrines, whereby mankind was to obtain salvation, have long remained, if Christ our Lord had not established a teaching authority, that was to last forever, to train the minds of men to faith. And the Church, strengthened by the promises of her Divine Author, and taking for her pattern His charity, has executed His commands so perfectly, that this alone has always been her aim, this her all-absorbing wish, to teach religion and to fight continually with error. To this end are certainly directed the sleepless labors of all the bishops; to this end the sanctioned laws and decrees of the Councils, and especially the constant solicitude of the Roman Pontiffs, with whom, as the successors in the primacy of the Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, rests both the right and the duty of teaching and confirming the brethren in the faith. But since, as the Apostle gives warning, *through philosophy and vain deceit*<sup>2</sup> the minds of the faithful are wont to be deceived, and the sincerity of faith corrupted among men, therefore the Supreme Pastors of the Church deemed it their incessant duty likewise to promote with all their energies science in its truest acceptation, and, at the same time, with special vigilance, to provide that all branches of human knowledge, and especially *philosophy*, upon which the proper condition of the other sciences in a great measure depends, should be imparted everywhere according to the rule of the Catholic faith. And we ourselves did admonish you briefly among other things

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Coloss. ii. 8.

adds much to its nobility, keen-sightedness, and vigor. And when they devote their mental energies to refuting opinions contrary to faith, and to proving what agrees with the same, they worthily and usefully employ reason; for, in the former case, they detect the causes of error and see the fault of the arguments on which they rest; in the latter, they master the force of the reasons by which they may be solidly proved, and bring home conviction to any prudent man. And he who thinks that by this study and exercise the resources and faculties of the mind are not increased and developed, must hold absurdly that the discrimination between truth and error is not conducive to the progress of the mind. The Vatican Council, therefore, properly notes in these words the distinguished benefits which are conferred upon reason by faith: "Faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge."<sup>1</sup> And therefore man, if he were wise, should not blame faith as being the enemy of reason and natural truths, but should rather render due thanks to God and rejoice exceedingly, because, amid many causes of ignorance and among the waves of error, the most holy faith has dawned upon him, and, like a friendly star, shows him the harbor of truth without any danger of going astray.

If you look back, Venerable Brethren, at the history of philosophy, you will perceive that what we have just said is proved by the facts themselves. For even those who were considered the wisest of the ancient philosophers, but who had not the gift of faith, erred most grievously in many things. You well know how often they taught, along with many truths, things false and absurd, and very many that were uncertain and doubtful, respecting the true nature of God, the first origin of things, the government of the world, the divine knowledge of futurity, the cause and origin of evil, man's last end and eternal happiness, respecting virtues and vices, and many other subjects, a true and certain knowledge of which is of the utmost importance to the human race.

On the other hand, the early doctors and Fathers of the Church,—who clearly understood from God's will and counsel that Christ, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God,<sup>2</sup> and "in whom are hidden all treasures of wisdom and knowledge," is also the restorer of human science,<sup>3</sup>—undertook to investigate the books of ancient sages and to compare their opinions with revealed doctrines, and, exercising a prudent discrimination, they adopted whatever they met with in them that was wisely thought and truly expressed, rejecting or correcting all the rest.

For as God, in His supreme Providence, for the defence of the Church raised up valiant martyrs, who counted their lives as nothing against the cruelty of tyrants, so, too, He opposed to the falsely-styled philosophers or heretics men of the greatest wisdom, who should defend, with the help also of human reason, the treasures of revealed truth.

Now, from the very beginning of the Church, Catholic doctrine had to encounter most bitter foes, who, in mockery of Christian dogmas and institutions, asserted that there were many gods, that the matter of the world was without beginning or cause, and that the course of all events was determined by some blind force and fixed necessity, and not ruled by the counsel of Divine Providence. But these teachers of false doctrine were speedily attacked by wise men, whom we call *Apologists*, who, under the guidance of faith, took their arguments from human science, by which they proved that one God, excelling in every form of perfec-

<sup>1</sup> Const. dogm. de Fid. Cath. c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. i. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Coloss. ii. 3.

can claim this privilege, or what is the true canon, are treated as occasion offers in either section.

In the first section Dr. Ubaldi unfolds at some length the true Catholic idea of inspiration as defined by the Tridentine, and more fully still by the Vatican Council; and rejects the loose theories of mere negative assistance or partial inspiration, that refers only to doctrinal points, or *subsequent* inspiration, the very name of which theory betrays its absurdity. And here the reader may find a full historical account of the famous propositions attributed to Lessius and Du Hamel, but in reality, if not coined, at least foully misstated by those worthy precursors of Jansenism, the disciples of Baius. The actual, not the forged, propositions have never been condemned by the Church. In giving a clear and full historical synopsis of this whole affair, Dr. Ubaldi has rendered a great service to the student of Scripture; for these propositions though much talked about are not thoroughly understood by many, and to correctly judge of them some knowledge of their history is required. And this can only be obtained from books that are seldom within the reach of students. In this section also the author begins to discuss the question: How are we to arrive at the certainty that the Scriptures are inspired? He shows that there is no possible way of getting at the truth with certainty unless by the external testimony of a divinely commissioned witness. He easily refutes the *criteria* formerly proposed by those who rejected the Church and her authority; namely, the sublimity of style and matter in the Scriptures, inward feeling, and the testimony of the Holy Ghost in the heart of the reader. These miserable subterfuges no longer delude the Protestant world. It has become ashamed of them, in spite of the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Confession. In fact, these *criteria* are no longer needed. Sincere Protestants of the unlettered sort believe, as they always did, in spite of their theory, on the Catholic principle of authority. Amongst the learned there is scarcely one who fully believes in inspiration, or indeed is aware of its true meaning. The inspiration they hold to does not deserve the name, for it is of the loosest kind, and has the rationalistic, unchristian stamp.

To the second section, which treats of the Canonlicity of Scripture, Dr. Ubaldi devotes the principal portion of the volume, nearly 400 pages. He examines first, whence is it that we may learn with certainty the entire canon (or list) of the Divine books, and proves clearly by exclusion that the authority of the Church is the only source whence such certainty can be derived. He then gives quite a learned history of the canon of Scripture both in the Old Testament and in the New. It is as full and exhaustive a statement as could be compressed into a textbook. After this he enters upon an elaborate vindication of the truth of the canon that was approved by the Fathers of Trent. In his first volume he had already sufficiently explained in what sense our Vulgate was declared authentic by the same fathers. As the principal difficulty urged by Protestants and Rationalists against the Tridentine canon lies in the deuterocanonical books, so it is to their defence mainly that the learned Professor applies himself in this portion of the volume. He proves his point by explicit testimonies of proto-canonical Scripture, by the implicit approval bestowed on the Alexandrine (or Septuagint) version by our Lord and His Apostles, and by the perpetual tradition of the Church. In addition to these ordinary proofs he adds some others of a most interesting character drawn from the treasures of Sacred Archaeology, and especially from its latest discoveries. Finally, a good account (lacking in most textbooks) is given of the Apocryphal and lost

called "of Odessa," now in St. Petersburg, and which dates from A. D. 916; also of a Greek MS. of Grotta Ferrata, of the eleventh century, which (like the Urbino-Vatican) seems never to have been collated.

We must congratulate Dr. Ubaldi and his disciples on having completed so much of his learned and most praiseworthy labors. The volume that is to follow will contain, it is said, the *Introductio Exegetica* with Biblical Archæology. And then we shall be in possession of a full and magnificent textbook for Biblical Science, not only good for colleges and universities, but of great value for those clergymen who wish to continue and improve their Biblical studies. And if he but made a compendium of it, as he has partly promised, there could be no better class-book for our American seminaries.

---

THE HUMAN SPECIES. By A. De Quatrefages. International Scientific Series. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

The partisans of evolution have possessed themselves of so many of the scientific periodicals of the day, that we are sometimes apt to forget the existence of a goodly number of eminent men and leaders of thought, who, in the scientific camp itself, are striking sturdy blows against the doctrine. Yet, in fact, it is but a short time since Mr. Darwin candidly confessed that "of the older and more honored chiefs in natural science, many unfortunately are still opposed to evolution in every form." The present work of M. De Quatrefages comes in good time to confirm this admission, and to prove that these venerable chiefs are not without solid reasons, based on well-known facts, for their unwillingness to follow in the rank and file of evolution.

The book is an account of the author's views on the science of Anthropology in its present condition, together with the work which has been done in the past to bring it to this condition. It is divided into ten books, under the following heads: Unity of the Human Species; Its Origin, Antiquity, Original Localization; Peopling of the Globe; Acclimatization of the Human Species; Primitive Man; Formation of the Human Races; Fossil Human Races; Present Human Races; Physical Characters; Psychological Characters of the Human Species.

M. De Quatrefages begins by endeavoring to settle clearly the meaning of the term *species* in the animal and vegetable kingdom; a notion which the evolutionist doctrines now current have done much to obscure. *Species*, according to his definition, is "a collection of individuals, more or less resembling each other, which may be regarded as having descended from a single primitive pair by an uninterrupted succession of families." *Resemblance*, therefore, and *filiation*, are the two elements essential to species. *Variety* is "an individual, or a number of individuals belonging to the same sexual generation, which is distinguished from the other representatives of the same species by one or several exceptional characters." When the characters peculiar to a variety become hereditary, a *race* is formed. That the various groups of beings to which the term species has always been applied, are really and permanently distinct from each other, independently of the conceptions of the mind, and in spite of variations in form, color, and even structure, is shown by the fact, that however widely races of the same species may differ among themselves, the product of a union of these races is fertile, in some cases more so than when two individuals of the same race are brought together; whereas when species, long recognized as distinct by other characters, are crossed, we not only require unusually favorable circumstances to insure an offspring, but that offspring is invariably



The Rev. Adrian Rouquette (like his brother Dominic) is a true poet and is well known for his *Antoniade*, *Trois Ages*, *Proèmes Patriotiques*, and other poems. But his muse is not confined to the French tongue. When it pleases her, she soars aloft in English strains. A volume of his poems in this language was highly extolled in the *Southern Quarterly Review*, some twenty-five years ago, by no less a critic than William Gilmore Simms.

That he is a poet will be recognized by any one who reads the *Nouvelle Atala*, which is really a charming little poem in prose. Simple as a tale of romance, it is of a far higher order than the books of fiction which form the delight of the century. In real merit it surpasses even many of those which have emerged from the crowd and gained for themselves a widespread reputation. We will not mar the reader's pleasure by any foretaste of the heroine's history, as sketched by our author. The spiritual beauty of her face in the picture which adorns the frontispiece, tells of a being etherealized by separation from the world and its gross herd, and by perpetual communion with Nature and Nature's God.

We warmly commend to our readers this exquisite little idyl, replete with the beauties of Nature and of Faith. It breathes the balmy air of our Southern forests, but is even still more redolent of the fragrant perfume of religion. And we venture to predict that no one who takes up this little book will lay it down until he has got through the entire volume.

---

DE VIRTUTIBUS INFUSIS PRÆLECTIONES SCHOLASTICO-DOGMATICÆ QUAS IN GREGORIANA UNIVERSITATE HABEBAT A.D. MDCCCLXXXVIII-IX. *Camillus Mazzella*, Soc. Jesu in eadem Universitate Sacræ Theologiæ Professor. Romæ: ex Typographia Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, MDCCCLXXXIX. Large 8vo., pp. 791.

The distinguished author, to the great regret of his brethren in Maryland, was some time ago summoned from Woodstock to Rome, to fill one of the chairs of Theology in the Roman College, or, as it is officially styled, the Gregorian University, from the name of its founder, Gregory XIII. That he has not been idle in his new field of labor is sufficiently attested by the splendid volume before us. It treats of the three great infused virtues, Faith, Hope, and Charity, commonly known as the theological virtues, and so called because they are by God alone infused, and became known only from divine revelation, but above all because they have God for their immediate object. This, however, does not exclude the infusion of other moral virtues, as the author shows from Innocent III., the Council of Vienne, the Roman Catechism, and the Fathers.

One might wonder at such a large volume written upon the theological bearings of Faith, Hope, and Charity. But if he will only run his eye over the questions discussed by F. Mazzella, and thus get some idea of their number and importance, he will rather wonder how the learned author has contrived to give so much in a comparatively small space. There are a hundred intricate questions connected with Faith alone, which would fill volumes, on some of which a great deal of light has been thrown by the definitions of the late Vatican Council. And to these F. Mazzella has devoted special attention. Indeed he makes no secret of his design to give in this part of his work a full commentary on the Vatican *Constitutio de Fide*. But there remain other obscure questions yet undefined, and which are debated *hinc inde* with varying solutions in the schools. All Christians know that in believing they are giving

their assent to the truth that God reveals, nor do they ever trouble themselves (nor is it necessary) with analyzing the nature of that assent. But this is the duty of the theologian. He must separate belief or assent from that trust or confidence (*fiducia*) with which some ignorantly or maliciously confound it; he must determine what part has the intellect, and what the will, in eliciting the act of faith; further, what is the character of the judgment passed on the motives of credibility before assenting, and many questions of a like kind. Indeed F. Mazzella devotes nearly six-sevenths of his large volume to Faith alone. We regret that we have not room at present to give a full synopsis of the more important portion of this treatise, especially where the author speaks of the *assensus fidei* and of the relation of Faith to Science. In another number we shall return to the subject.

We hope that all those who have Father Mazzella's other volumes, will add this to their collection. They will find it a valuable mine of information on some of the vital questions of the day.

---

IS LIFE WORTH LIVING? By *William Hurrell Mallock*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879. 12mo. Pp. 323.

This book is both interesting and remarkable from whatever standpoint it may be viewed. The English is clear and nervous. What the author has to say he says well. When the substance of the subject-matter first appeared, nearly three years ago, in a London periodical, it created a sensation, and ever since an article from the pen of Mr. Mallock was sure to command a wide circle of readers. He looks the issues of the day full in the face, and questions them till, dropping figure and allegory, enigma and illusory phrasings, they give the true answers. The author has an acute intellect. He searches and probes, analyzes and dissects with precision and accuracy. All this makes his book delightful reading. Each chapter reminds one of a dialogue of Plato. It abounds in the same Socratic irony. The author can be playful or serious, as the point at issue requires him to be.

The book—though its several chapters originally appeared in periodicals—has a unity of plan. It may be divided into three parts. In the first, the author unmasks Positivism, and shows that whatever is good and wholesome in the moral standard it would establish is neither more nor less than the old-time morality of Christianity. Eliminate that, and a reign of dulness is inaugurated, in comparison with which the chaos of Pope's *Dunciad* were respectable. In the second part the author turns to Protestantism for a solution of his questionings. But Protestantism he finds a blank. It is to him—as it is to every logical mind—the negation of the supernatural order. “We are at last beginning to see in it neither the purifier of a corrupt revelation, nor the corruption of a pure revelation, but the practical denier of all revelation whatever” (p. 268). Finally, the author shows that in the Catholic Church alone is to be found a refuge against the encroachments of Atheism, and that the only two poles of thought which human reason can logically rest in are either Atheism or Catholicity. This is the outcome of the book. The conclusion is startling, when we remember that it was penned by one who is an outsider—a skeptic. But all honor to him for possessing the moral courage to speak his convictions.

Mr. Mallock is stronger in analysis than in synthesis. With keenest critical acumen he exposes the subterfuges which the skeptical optimism of the day resorts to, in attempting to conceal its illogical conclusions and self-contradictions; but his references to Catholicity are open on some

